

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_118477
Title of the Manuscript:	Quality Attributes of Chinchin Produced with blends of flour from Cassava and Bambara Groundnut ( <i>Vigna subterranea</i> )
Type of the 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://www.journalejns.com/index.php/EJNFS/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> <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>good enough for the development of science</p> <p>The relationship between titles, abstracts and methods, results and discussion is not yet one order so it is rather difficult to understand</p> <p>Not Comprehensive, Need Improvement</p> <p>generally appropriate</p> <p>yes</p> <p>Some references do not match. Need to add references that are internationally indexed, for example quartile 1-4</p>	<p>Suggestions and improvements have been written in the manuscript (such as the appendix)</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>corrected grammar</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>This article provides useful information for communities in developing food. However, authors should further explore the weaknesses and advantages of writing strategies and results and data processing before recommending such strategies</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>Mochammad Farkan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Jakarta Technical University of Fisheries, Indonesia</b>