

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_111155
Title of the Manuscript:	Health and nutritional qualities of precooked sauces produced using local ingredients
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> 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>1. Yes, the work presented is a multidisciplinary field of study from different aspects of view, and the results for the physicochemical and microbiological quality of precooked ingredients are presented clearly. While the clarification of the ingredients individually has to be described,.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title is representative.</p> <p>3. The abstract does not describe the clear methods used and might be rewritten as per the journal style.</p> <p>4. The manuscript is well prepared in a structured section, while the subsections are not briefly outlined.</p> <p>The materials and methods are not appropriate; standard test methods should also be used. The author should describe the place of study in detail for the materials and chemicals, and a detailed statistical analysis of the results has to be done.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientific; however, the research design, extraction methods, and experimental analysis are not discussed in detail (ANOVA table).</p> <p>6. No, old references have to be removed and replaced by recent ones, and the citations in the text are not formatted well, and the bibliography is not presented with full information about the journal.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No, the writing language of the manuscript is very poor, and it is not suitable in this form.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>As a blind reviewer, I believe the article is not suitable for publication at this stage and needs further improvement. The authors also suggested supporting their work with visual images, like for microbial analysis. Figures 1 and 2 have to be of maximum resolution.</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:	Chirato Godana Korra
Department, University & Country	Wolkite University, Ethiopia