

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_111160
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Physicochemical, Functional and Morphological Characteristics of Starch Extracted from Defatted Conophor Seed (<i>Tetracapidium conophorum</i>).
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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The manuscript's significance lies in its potential to introduce novel insights and address critical gaps, offering valuable contributions to the scientific community</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No, should rewrite the abstract</p> <p>The manuscript's novelty in relation to existing literature needs to be more thoroughly justified, clearly highlighting its unique contributions.</p> <p>yes Verify that the references conform to the journal's prescribed format and criteria. Expand the discussion by citing and discussing additional reference articles to bolster and substantiate the claims made in the article.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Enhance readability by ensuring the language is clear and concise, enabling a broader audience, including non-specialists, to grasp the study's strengths.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Emphasize the strengths of the objectives more explicitly in the introduction section to provide a clear roadmap for the study. 2. Elaborate further on the methodology used in the study to ensure comprehensive understanding and replicability. 3. Expand the discussion by citing and discussing additional reference articles to bolster and substantiate the claims made in the article. 4. Strengthen the discussion section by providing deeper analysis, interpretation, and contextualization of the findings within the existing literature, thereby enhancing the manuscript's overall impact. <p>These revisions should help address the identified areas for improvement in the manuscript.</p>	

[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:	P. Senthilkumar
Department, University & Country	Dr. GR. Damodaran College of Science, India