

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_118662
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutritional Advantages of Finger millet and Opportunities for Its Processing: A Comprehensive Review
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://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The discoveries presented hold promise in significantly advancing the understanding within the scientific community, particularly on nutritional Advantages of Finger millet and Opportunities for Its Processing.</p> <p>2. The title of the article effectively captures the essence of the research endeavors undertaken.</p> <p>3. The abstract offers a comprehensive synopsis of the principal elements of the research, encompassing its objectives, methodologies, outcomes, and conclusions. It adeptly encapsulates the primary findings and implications of the study, all within a concise word limit of under 300 words (119).</p> <p>4. The subsections and structural layout of the manuscript are skilfully arranged, ensuring a coherent and logical progression throughout. Each section seamlessly integrates with the next, enhancing the overall coherence of the manuscript.</p> <p>5. The manuscript demonstrates scientific rigor, characterized by lucid methodological approaches and meticulous data analysis procedures. The conclusions drawn are firmly rooted in the presented results, and the interpretations are judiciously derived from the evidence provided.</p> <p>6. The references cited in the manuscript are ample and contemporaneous, with coverage extending up to the year 2020 and including relevant literature pertinent to the field.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Certainly: Indeed, the article's language and English proficiency are apt for scholarly discourse. The manuscript exhibits a commendable mastery of the English language, characterized by articulate and cohesive writing that aptly communicates the research findings and arguments.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Adamou Oumarou Aboubacar
Department, University & Country	Université Boubacar Bâ de Tillabéri, Niger