

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJFRN_117541</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Comparison on fiber rich food consumption in urban and rural areas of Khulna region</b>
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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community. Because it gives some pieces of information for the first time regarding the fibre rich foods intake in urban and rural areas of Khulna region.</p> <p>2. <b>New title suggestion:</b> Consumption of fibre rich foods: comparative study in urban and rural areas of Khulna region, southwestern Bangladesh.</p> <p>3. No, the abstract of the article is not clear enough. <i>Abstract is the concise straight-to-the-point information on the totality of the research.</i> Therefore, it should contain the key following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Background justification of the research</li> <li>• The aim of the research</li> <li>• Methods in brief</li> <li>• Important findings</li> <li>• Conclusion</li> </ul> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5. No, I do not.</p> <p>6. The references are quite sufficient but not recent. The author has to harmonise the in-text citations using either Mendeley software or Zotero.</p> <p>7. Two recent papers are attached as a guideline for corrections.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>No, the English quality of the article is not suitable for scholarly communication: grammatical agreements violated throughout the manuscript.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Introduction</b> should clearly contain some brief information on the subject matter including problems that necessitated the research, research justification, aims.</li> <li>• The study design must be a cross-sectional and needs to be more clear in the methodology section.</li> <li>• <b>Discussion:</b> Compare and relate results with the latest works in the area.</li> </ul>	

### 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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Moudi Aboubacar Mahamadou Rabiou</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Ahmadu Bello University of Zaria, Nigeria</b>