

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_96264
Title of the Manuscript:	Studies on the quality characteristics of flour blends from Sesame seeds, African yam bean and Moringa leaf Powder for “biscuit- like” making
Type of the 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>

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ The quality properties of flour blends made from sesame seeds, African yam bean (AYB), and Moringa leaf powder (MLP) for "biscuit-like" manufacture were explored in this well-written paper. ❖ The title properly explains the purpose and objective of the article, however, prepositions should start with a lowercase letter. ❖ The abstract offers an accurate summary of the paper, and the language used in the abstract is easy to read and understand. ❖ The manuscript is well designed and appropriate in terms of structure and organization. ❖ The manuscript is scientifically outstanding. ❖ The references are sufficient and have been cited and compared correctly. ❖ Both additions and corrections were outlined in red color. ❖ Many of the words outlined in yellow should be deleted. ❖ Please re-arrange the keywords alphabetically. ❖ Introduction: Please rephrase the objective of the study to avoid repetition ❖ Results: Tables: The tables present the results very well. However, they should include the full names of the abbreviations in the bottom margin of the tables. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Adding line numbers may be useful for reviewing. ❖ Yes, the language of the article is suitable and easy to read and understand. However, grammar: need Some revision along the manuscript. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ In general, the paper is well written, and the manuscript is relevant and informative. ❖ Title: the title properly explains the purpose and objective of the article ❖ Abstract: The abstract offers an accurate summary of the paper, and the language used in the abstract is easy to read and understand. ❖ Introduction: The authors provide sufficient context on the subject. ❖ Tables: Clear and comprehensible 	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Manal Hadi Ghaffoori Kanaan
Department, University & Country	Technical Institute of Suwaria, Middle Technical University, Iraq