

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFRN_119448
Title of the Manuscript:	The Significance of Carrot and Drumstick leaves as a Functional Food
Type of the Article	Review Article

### General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://journalajfrn.com/index.php/AJFRN/editorial-policy>)

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The concept work and the idea of the manuscript is acceptable for scientific community. but the topic of this manuscript is not explained urgently.</li> <li>It's okay, but the title lacks detail in describing the manuscript.</li> <li>the abstract not connected. Totally not has coherence or flow ideas appropriately. So, the author should be rewriting again the abstract of the article comprehensively. The review article written is not yet comprehensive</li> <li>it's okay. But The author has very little data. It is best to include supporting data in the review article</li> <li>very weak. The manuscript should be rewritten again by including scientific evidence and supporting literatures.</li> <li>Authors should be cited all the reference used in the introduction section appropriately. There is a lot of review that researchers need to do in writing the introductory chapter</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>Authors should be re-modifying again to be suitable for scholars. There is a lot of review that researchers need to do in writing the introductory chapter</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Dewa Ayu Made Adnyaswari</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Udayana University, Indonesia</b>