

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_97499
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of single and double treatment methods on the micronutrients in Mucuna pruriens (velvet bean) seed flour.
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. The manuscript is crucial to the scientific community. The study revealed the treatment methods that could improve or depreciate the various micronutrient contents of Mucuna pruriens seeds while eliminating antinutritional factors in them. Such enlightenment provided by the results of this study could help in addressing nutritional insecurity common in that part of the country. Also the results could serve as a guide for effective utilization of underutilized pulses like Mucuna pruriens seeds in food preparations. 2. The title of the article is suitable but the author(s) could modify it by adopting the reviewer's comments. 3. Yes, but the author(s) should make the abstract better by following the reviewer's recommendations. 4. Slight deviations from the standards were observed but could be handled by following reviewer's recommendations. 5. Yes. 6. Yes.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, but the author(s) should revise the manuscript as per the reviewer's comments	
Optional/General comments	w The author(s) should painstakingly revise the manuscript as per the recommendations.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Okereke Goodluck Obioma
Department, University & Country	Benue State University, Nigeria