

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFRN_119907
Title of the Manuscript:	Development and standardization of lemongrass into coffee powder for preparing Cappuccino
Type of the Article	Short Research Article

### 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>1. <b>No because only sensory evaluation was conducted as a test. There is no analyses on the the health benefits of the formutalted beverages.</b></p> <p>2. <b>No because there is no work in the materials and methods leading to the standardazition of the of lemongrass into coffee powder because the age and other informations on the leaves of the lemon grass used are not known. Also the part of the lemon grass used is not mentioned in the title.</b></p> <p>3. <b>Yes</b></p> <p>4. <b>No, the authors should restructure the manuscript. There should be no sub-headings in the introduction and the materials and methods should contain numbered sub-headings. Table 1 mentioned in the section for Results and Discussion should normally appear in the section for Materials and methods. The titles of the tables should be on top of the tables. In fact the rewriting of the manuscript is undeniable. On Figure 2 the different samples cannot be identified. Figure 3 representing the sheet for sensory analysis is not appropriate, there is a better way to present sensory evaluation in the materials and methods, please refer to others publications. Table 2 and Figure 4 present the same results, between the two, only one should be used as the same results should not be presented twice. Also radar representation is the most used for sensory evaluation results.</b></p> <p>5. <b>NO</b></p> <p>6. <b>The references are recent although the format or style is not uniform.</b></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 the language quality is very poor.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript should be rewritten and the title changed A better language quality should be suitable</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<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:	<b>Feumba Dibanda Romelle</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Buea, Cameroon</b>