

## Review Form 1.8

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Annual Research &amp; Review in Biology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_120165
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Pigmented Rice: A Source of Health and Longevity</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

### **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://www.journalarrb.com/index.php/ARRB/editorial-policy> )

## Review Form 1.8

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

<b>Compulsory</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>
Is the manuscript important for scientific community? <i>(Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)</i>	<b>The manuscript is important for the scientific community because it shows the importance of pigmented rice in the human diet. Consuming pigmented rice is good for the body.</b>	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<b>the title of the article is suitable</b>	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>	<b>The abstract is incomplete because it does not address the issues that prompted the study.</b>	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	<b>Titles should be numbered and the article should be structured as follows: abstract, introduction, method, results and discussion and conclusion</b>	
<b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> <i>(Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)</i>	<b>Several parts of the study are missing. There is no methodology for this study. In the methodology section we should have the guidelines This review follows which principle of systematics. For example, we follow the PRISMA guidelines (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses). It is based on searches carried out on which sites. For example, you could use the Web of Science site or Scopus or google scholar. The study covers which period. In the results and discussion section, what results did you obtain?</b>	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>	<b>Read this article for inspiration</b> <a href="https://doi.org/10.3390/plants13121613">https://doi.org/10.3390/plants13121613</a>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Minor revision	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	This is a systematic review, so the author should take stock of previous studies. Are the previous reviews that have dealt with pigmented rice generally old and/or with partial coverage both geographically and thematically? Has a bibliometric and thematic analysis been carried out for your continent as a whole? Are there any recent systematic reviews or not? In this context, the present systematic review should analyse the limitations of previous studies. This will make it possible to announce the objectives of your study on spiced rice.	

**Review Form 1.8**

**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>Nikiema Dominique</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University Joseph Ki-Zerbo, Burkina Faso</b>