

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_AJFRN_117801
Title of the Manuscript:	Bioactive compound, chemicals properties, physical and sensory properties of biscuit produced from defatted sesame seed flour and unripe plantain flour blend
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://journalajfrn.com/index.php/AJFRN/editorial-policy>

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>It is important</p> <p>YES</p> <p>Not comprehensive lack the aim, briefly concise method, conclusion</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Somehow</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>COMMENT FOR MANUSCRIPT TITLE 'Bioactive compound, chemicals properties, physical and sensory properties of biscuit produced from defatted sesame seed flour and unripe plantain flour blend' From a general point of view the manuscript contain result of stated parameters in the topic, however the introduction lack many information as the problem the authors want to solve, novelty, objective of the study or aim, results are not well interpreted and discussed; conclusion is based on what objective?</p> <p>Abstract section</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The abstract has to be reformulated highlighting the aim of the study, brief methodology, result and conclusion. <p>Introduction section</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The sentence 'It is mostly cultivated for his low cholesterol as dietary oil for specific medical cases ' has to be reformulated to <i>It is mostly cultivated for its low cholesterol as dietary oil for specific medical cases.</i> The introduction has to be restructure bringing out a brief background, problem, previous work proposed to solve this problem, bring novelty and objective of the study. <p>Material and method section</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>On what bases was the different flour ratio made?</i> <i>What type of sensory test was carried as if the authors did hedonic test, the recommended number of panelists has to be at least 60.</i> <p>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> THE paragraph 'The result of crude fiber content shows a range from 21.95% to 29.15% respectively. The samples ratio decreases: 29.15% (80:20), 27.45% (60:40), 27.25% (50:50), 24.35% (100%), 23.95% (70:30) and 3.63% (90:10). 29.15% (80:20) has the highest fiber content which may be because the fiber content may be because unripe plantain and sesame seed are good source of fiber, which help in easy digestion and bowel removal according to (Agu, 2014)' is not understandable. Does it mean decreasing the amount of sesame increase the fiber content? The logic is not uniform. Thus authors are 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>called to reconsider their interpretation in this section.</p> <p>7) The result for proximate composition would be understandable if authors include the values proximate content parameters for plantain as the logic of the protein content interpreted is not what is seen in the table with sample 80:20 having a lower protein content compare to 70:30,60:40 and 50:50. Does it means the plantain has a higher protein content compare to sesame?</p> <p><i>CONCLUSION SECTION</i></p> <p>8) <i>The conclusion has to be reformulated base on the objective of the study which is no way to be found in the introduction.</i></p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Njapndounke Bilkissou)
Department, University & Country	University of Yaounde I, Cameroon