

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_87028
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of Packaging on Proximate and Mineral Compositions of Ndop Rice (Tox Variety) During Storage
Type of the 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.journalafsj.com/index.php/AFSJ/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The introduction must clearly present the context and objective of the study carried out. It should contain a history of the problem, the methods of solution and the theories used in general to solve the problem. It should show the research guiding questions. These questions should highlight the link between the research and the others that preceded it. Questions should clearly show the research's relationship to your field of study.</p> <p>The theoretical frameworks used must be richly described in order to guide the reasoning throughout the work. It must justify the nature and content of the hypotheses, the methods used to analyze the data, as well as the instruments for gathering facts and data.</p> <p>The Methodology must contain a section qualifying the type of research in terms of the methods and means used. It must describe, justifying, qualifying and quantifying the sample, population and research universe. It should bring: a) a step-by-step description of how the research was conducted. A detailed description of the research instruments; b) a detailed description of the data analysis method; c) a detailed review of the hypotheses and key questions that test them, relating them to research instruments and data analysis methods. Whenever possible, analyzing consequences of results; d) an analysis of the advantages, disadvantages and limitations of the methodology, as well as ways to circumvent these limitations that were employed by the author.</p> <p>The results obtained must be relevant. Emphasis must be given to the contribution made by the work to society, to theory, to technique, to the university in which it was carried out and to the research group in which it belongs.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pedro Vieira Souza Santos
Department, University & Country	Brazil