

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_AJFRN_117867
Title of the Manuscript:	Enhancing Nutritional Value: Formulation and Analysis of Rice Cake Enriched with Green Gram Pea
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://journalajfrn.com/index.php/AJFRN/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	 1. This manuscript is important because it is not just about increasing the nutritional value of rice cake by adding green gram peas. This is about providing practical solutions for the cake industry. This research can be used as a reference for further studies. Still, more importantly, it equips the cake industry with essential information to develop cake innovations that are popular and nutritious to the public. 2. The title is appropriate 3. The abstract is satisfactory. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript have been satisfactory 5. Scientifically, the manuscript is correct and explains the research results supported by relevant references. 6. The references used are pretty good. It's best to add some recent references (from the last five years).	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	 The language used was appropriate and easy to understand in the scientific community.	
Optional/General comments	 This manuscript is important because it presents the most up-to-date information on cake formulations that can be nourished by adding green gram peas. Including proximate analysis data not only enhances the study's credibility but is a compelling tool to attract cake entrepreneurs to develop healthier and more appealing products.	

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?	 (If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bahidin Laode Mpapa
Department, University & Country	Muhammadiyah University of Luwuk Banggai, Indonesia