

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_95718
Title of the Manuscript:	Popular Products of Sesame (Sesamum indicum L.) Consumed in India and their Quality Concern
Type of the Article	Minireview 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)
<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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1 – This manuscript is important for scientific community, however it has to be rewritten considering the improvements needed in the whole text's structure regarding coherence and relevance. It is necessary to provide more information about the nutritional quality of the sesame, and the advantages or possible damages for the organisms as well.</p> <p>2 – It's a suitable title, meanwhile the following text needs to provide enough information about the topic mentioned.</p> <p>3 – The abstract needs to be rewritten. It does not specify the main goal of this review, neither the methodology used, for example where the author has found those references and the whole content of this study. Also, in the conclusion, it does not express the same idea of the conclusion section, in the end of the manuscript. It is basically just the introduction in this section, but it's really important to represent the main topics of the study and to be clear in this part.</p> <p>4 – The topics' titles are appropriate, but I suggest to describe more detailed because these subsections are the results of the research, and it's missing a better explanation of the nutritional composition and quality concerns. It's needed to discuss more the nutritional characteristics provided in the table. The conclusion shows results just about microbiological topic. In general, it's poorly structured and cohesive.</p> <p>5- The manuscript does not obtain a solid scientific base to be published. The manner of the research was conducted does not aggregate enough relevance to the academy area.</p> <p>6- The references are recent and sufficient.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Grammar must be improved. I suggest to rewrite this research carefully, there's a lack of coherence in many sentences, lack of commas, connectives, verbs or words. And also I propose to pay attention in using different adjectives; applying connectives, being sure it will be possible to understand the link between the sentences.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The text, among the topics, is sometimes repetitive; there's a lack of information about the main product and the nutritional subject, it could be better written with more searches; the only table presented does not have the reference under it (even if it was author's)</p>	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tauani Martins Schneider
Department, University & Country	Federal Institute of Santa Catarina, Brazil