

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_116537
Title of the Manuscript:	Sporicidal Treatments to Produce Germinated Finger Millet
Type of the Article	food science 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.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/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><u>Compulsory</u> 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 very perfect</p> <p>2. The title is perfect</p> <p>3. The abstract is quite lengthy and includes detailed methodology and results. It should be concise (around 150-250 words) and focus on the main objectives, findings, and conclusions.</p> <p>4. The paper follows a logical structure, but some sections could be rearranged or combined for better flow and coherence.</p> <p>5. Yes (but consider the correction).</p> <p>6. Some references are cited multiple times; consider rephrasing sentences to avoid repetition.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There are few grammatical errors and punctuation mistake in the work.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>In general this work is good , however i feel if this few point are considered the work satisfactory.</p> <p>In the abstract, consider adding a brief summary of the results and conclusions to provide a clearer overview.</p> <p>In the introduction, you mention the significance of finger millet and its applications, but it would be helpful to explicitly state the research gap or motivation behind investigating sporicidal treatments for germinated finger millet.</p> <p>The methodology section is detailed, but consider adding more information about the experimental design, sample sizes, and statistical analysis methods used.</p> <p>In the results section, consider using more visual aids like tables, figures, and graphs to present the data and make it easier to understand.</p> <p>The discussion section could be more detailed, connecting the results to the broader context and implications for the food industry.</p> <p>These points are minor and do not detract from the overall quality of your review article</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:	Tyolumun, Aondolumun Bartholomew
Department, University & Country	Joseph Sarwuan Tarka University Makurdi, Nigeria