

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_122267
Title of the Manuscript:	Standardization and Evaluation of Spice Incorporated Foxtail millet Cookies
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**Jack o f Nov elt y**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/> Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This paper is important and can contribute to the promotion of food security and nutrition in the study area. The originality of the study is related to the fact that the author had standardized the jeera incorporated foxtail millet cookies (FMC) by replacing wheat flour with different proportions of foxtail millet flour (20%, 40%, 50%, 80% and 100%). However, some corrections are needed.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is not clear and should be reformulated. “Standardization and Evaluation of Spice Incorporated Foxtail millet Cookies” can be replaced by “Standardization and Evaluation of techno functional and physicochemical properties of Foxtail millet Cookies processed with different Spice Incorporation rates”	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The Abstract may be reviewed. The aim of the study and the methodology part of the abstract must be reformulated as complete sentences. Moreover, a short background of the study may be given before the aim of the study	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Overall, there is a lack of statistical comparison test between the different treatment in the methodology. Subsequently, the effect of the proportions of spice incorporated foxtail millet cookies is not really known at the end of the study. The probability of difference between the treatment must be given in the results text, in the tables and in the abstract. The authors may avoid personifying in the test. “Dr. Samuel Johnson” in the	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Yes but the style of the references in the text must be reviewed by using the author guidelines. In the text, citations should be indicated by the reference number in brackets [3] not (3). References must be listed at the end of the manuscript and numbered in the order that they appear in the text. Every reference referred in the text must	
Minor REVISION comments	The authors may do the statistical analysis of the obtained data and improve the abstract and result section.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	No comment	

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:	Tougan Polycarpe Ulbad
Department, University & Country	University of Parakou, Republic of Bénin