

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_97585
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment and Characterization of Migrants from some Cook-in Food Packages Utilized in Nigeria – ‘Moi-Moi’, a Case Study
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalafsj.com/index.php/AFSJ/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. yes 2. no. Assessment and Characterization of residual concentration from some Cook-in Food Packages Utilized in Nigeria – ‘Moi-Moi’, a Case Study 3. yes 4. yes 5. yes 6. yes but some aged references that are 10 years ago it is good idea bcz those packaging materials could pose community to health risks	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Check and edit the language	
Optional/General comments	Title needs modification and in sensory evaluation parts there should also be procedure how it has been done In proximate analysis part LSD, researchers said Least square difference but it should be least significant difference.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ermias Dureto Badebo
Department, University & Country	Hawassa University, Ethiopia