

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFRN_115542
Title of the Manuscript:	Physico-chemical and nutritional characterization of dried mangoes consumed in Chad for better post-harvest valorization
Type of the Article	

## 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b>	<p>Yes. It has relevance to Nutrition and Economic value of food products</p> <p>Quite suitable</p> <p>Needs to be restructured. Flow of thoughts needs to be streamlined.</p> <p>Major additions required as the subsections and current structure of the manuscript are not adequate.</p> <p>Almost</p> <p>References need to be updated as only one of 2023 is available while all others are before 2020. The format is not uniform as in many places incomplete references are given. At several places the date of publication is not in brackets. Uniform format missing.</p> <p>1. Proper placement of of subject matter desired. Very abrupt presentation of ideas</p> <p>2. Sub-headings pertaining to subject being discussed must be given</p> <p>3. Language must be improved Major editing required to make the paper coherent and comprehensive</p> <p>4. The Discussion part of the paper needs to highlight specific aspects like content and properties as also special attributes of the sample understudy.</p> <p>5. The conclusion must be more focused. It is too general with a mere repetition of the discussion points.</p>	<p>Dear reviewer, it was a pleasure to read your comment concerning the manuscript. I assure you that all the remarks have been taken into account well revised as you suggested.</p> <p>Best regards</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The English language needs to be improved. Author is unable to frame thoughts in a smooth flowing manner.	The language have been improved
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	NA	

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