

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	

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes manuscript is beneficial for the scientific community but has few lacunas which need elaboration.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. No ethical approval mention II. Introduction part mentioned the contradictory details for coffee uses in various diseases III. Methodology is poorly defined not mention the sample size calculation and how many times coffee was given and how the reading were monitored and how many reading were taken of same concentration etc... IV. Discussion part is very weak <p>Yes</p> <p>Need minor changes explaining the methodology</p> <p>Need minor changes as indicated</p> <p>Need major changes as in terms of ethical clearance and methodology part</p> <p>Might need change when changing the methodology parts and according to discussion part</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Language part is suitable</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Points needing elaboration and changes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. No ethical approval mention II. Introduction part mentioned the contradictory details for coffee uses in various diseases III. Methodology is poorly defined not mention the sample size calculation and how many times coffee was given and how the reading were monitored and how many reading were taken of same concentration etc... IV. Discussion part is very weak 	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tanwir Alam
Department, University & Country	Bihar University of Health Sciences, India