

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>European Journal of Nutrition &amp; Food Safety</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_EJNFS_107776</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Proximate composition and physicochemical properties of halwa produced in the urban west region, Zanzibar</b>
Type of the Article	

## 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The article seems interesting but should be greatly improved.</p> <p>The title is appropriate.</p> <p>To an extent, it is. However, the grammar should be checked once more.</p> <p>Yes, they are.</p> <p>There are discrepancies which raises some doubts.</p> <p>Only 7 out of 27 references are up to date.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>No, it should be greatly improved upon.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Grammar should be greatly improved.</li> <li>2. The methodology stated for moisture content determination seems different from AOAC 2019 which the author claimed to have used.</li> <li>3. The type and model of equipment used for weighing and drying should be stated.</li> <li>4. The methodology should be re-casted; lacks good chronological sequence for scientific reporting.</li> <li>5. Why was 5.5 used as a conversion factor for protein instead of 6.25 which is the generally used protein conversion factor?</li> <li>6. There is inconsistency in the AOAC method used for analysis. The author reported using AOAC 2019 in the abstract for all analysis while at the same time reported using AOAC 2000 in some parts of the methodology.</li> <li>7. The author stated that the percentage carbohydrate was obtained by difference; however, the proximate compositions of the individual samples in table 1 do not sum up to 100%. For e.g. sample P1 = 98.578%, P2= 98.248%, P3=100.397%. This ought not to be so.</li> <li>8. Only 7 out of 27 references are up-to-date. The reference section should be updated.</li> </ol>	

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Okoroafor Chinedu Henry</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Nigerian Stored Products Research Institute, Nigeria</b>