

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFRN_99211
Title of the Manuscript:	Functional and Proximate Composition of Sorghum Starch Complemented with Germinated Moringa 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://journalajfrn.com/index.php/AJFRN/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. This manuscript deals with an important problem for mankind, malnutrition for children. One possibility to avoid this malnutrition is the use of some plants or combination of plants. This manuscript deals with addition of Moringa seed into sorghum starch. So, this manuscript is important for the scientific community. 2. Yes it is. 3. Yes perfectly. 4. Yes, it is. Just the discussion part must be increase. 5. Yes. 6. Yes, without problem.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. Yes, it is perfectly understandable.	
Optional/General comments	Just the tables 1 to 3 must be introduced in the text.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Gilles Olive
Department, University & Country	Ecole Industrielle et Commerciale de la Province de Namur, Belgium