

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_116122
Title of the Manuscript:	Amino Acid Compositions and In Vitro Anti-inflammatory Properties of Cookies produced from Wheat and Soybean Composite Flour
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>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. Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community, since the study concluded that cookies samples produced from mixtures of 60% wheat flour and 40% soybean flour gave good products for consumption since they are nutritionally more superior to those from whole-wheat flour. These cookies could serve as vehicular means for protein fortification and other nutritional improvement in Nigeria.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5. Yes, I think the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. Yes, the references are sufficient and recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p> <p>Although I have the following suggestions to improve the writing:</p> <p>1. On pages 3 and 10 add a space between the words that I marked in yellow.</p> <p>2. On page 10 correct the number in yellow, since it is written 30% whereas it should be 40%.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[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:	M. Javier Cruz Gomez
Department, University & Country	Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México