

## 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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. <b>The manuscript is important for the scientific community based on its content and findings.</b>  2. <b>The title of the article is suitable.</b>  3. <b>Comprehensive but slight addition recommended. See comment.</b>  4. <b>Yes</b>  5. <b>The manuscript is scientifically correct. The author has been able to show that with the relevant comparisons.</b>  6. <b>Sufficient but not recent</b>  <b>Attention to be [laced on the use of terms, and proper writing of scientific names.</b>	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	1. The language is suitable for scholarly communication	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The research and the results are relevant but the references cited are old.	

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

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pereowei Stephen Daworiye
Department, University & Country	Isaac Jasper Boro College of Education, Nigeria