

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_111919
Title of the Manuscript:	Production and quality evaluation of acha-cowpea-carrot based couscous
Type of the Article	Research paper

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, definitely. As the world population mainly depends on food for their survival, there is a necessity to know more about the production of particular food grains and the quality standard of certain flour, which would be easier to blend along with the nutritional health benefits to the consumer.</p> <p>Yes, the title seems to accurate for this paper. but if it can be modified in a better way, it would be unique.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The alignment of the paragraphs has to adjusted accordingly</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, the references are sufficient.</p> <p>This paper has some grammatical errors and few references are mismatched (references in the passage did not match with the reference section at the end) and need to check it thoroughly.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The topic and the information provided is quite good in this paper. But cross-checking the passages thoroughly in order to avoid any minor mistakes like unclear statements would make this paper even more unique.	

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kodavali Monika Reddy
Department, University & Country	Lovely Professional University, India