

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Agriculture</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_123696
Title of the Manuscript:	Analyzing the effect of germination on nutritional characteristics of kodo millet flour and its role in rusk development
Type of the Article	

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

#### **PART 1: Review Comments**

<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>		
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>		
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>		
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>		
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>		
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>		
<b>-</b>		

**Review Form 3**

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Review Report of Manuscript Number:2024_ARJA_123696</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> No particular numerical value of results has been mentioned in the abstract which makes it more generalized. Hence, it is required to mention the results obtained in the research precisely with numerical representation so that it will be helpful in getting idea about the whole research with its methodology and results on a single view. Abstract should be precise, data based and clear rather than being generalized.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The objectives of the research work should be mentioned clearly with bullet points.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The information about the materials used and the methods followed for germination process, color estimation, calculation of germination loss and germination efficiency and nutrient analysis is clear and detailed which can be referred for further research work by others.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> In result section, numbers of references are not properly written in appropriate places. It should be corrected.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The results obtained in the research regarding the germination loss, germination efficiency, color parameters, sensory evaluation and proximate analysis are properly discussed with reference to other research studies. The data mentioned are well controlled and robust based on facts and figures. All the discussions are well written in accordance to the tables mentioned.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The conclusion part is written properly as per the research methods and findings, can be a little more precise. The conclusion has been well supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Though all the references discussed in the research have been mentioned, all are not in a uniform format. This matter should be conveyed to the authors so that it can be written in a single uniform reference format as per the guidelines of the research journal. All the references cited are relevant and adequate.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Overall, the content and intent of the research paper is good. It can be accepted and considered for further publication process after including the minor suggestions and corrections mentioned in this report.</li> </ul>	

**PART 2:**

	<p><b>Reviewer's comment</b></p>	<p><b>Author's comment</b> (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>
<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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Soumya Sucharita Sahoo</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>S.D.A.U, India</b></p>