

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_108905
Title of the Manuscript:	QUALITY EVALUATION AND ORGANOLEPTIC PROPERTIES OF SOY-POUNDO YAM FLOUR
Type of the Article	Original Research article

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"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. 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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community. 2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable. 3. The abstract of the article is very comprehensive. 4. Yes, the structure and subsections of the manuscript are appropriate. 5. Yes, I think so. 6. The references are enough (41) and quite recent (all references are after the year 2000), with the mention that, some references are found in one form in the text and in other at bibliography (see below). 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	The language quality are suitable for the scholarly communication.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I believe that, the scientific article needs some minor revisions before being published. Some references are found in one way in the text, and in another way in the references (I have listed them below):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Achi, 2001 appears in the text and Achi, 2003 appears in the bibliography (which year is correct?); - Abiodun and Akinoso, 2014 appears in the text and Abiodun and Akinoso, 2014 (the correct form) appears in the bibliography; - Malowo et al. 2012 appears in the text and Malomo et al. 2012 (the correct form) appears in the references; - Allionor ana Akalezi, 2012 appears in the text and Alionnor and Akalezi, 2010 (the correct form) appears in the references; - Maestric et al., 2002 appears in the text and Maestric at al., 2007 appears in the references (which references is correct?). 	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mihai Iacob Bentea
Department, University & Country	University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine, Romania