

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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	Yes it is important It may be considered if possible technically improve Abstract is not comprehensive, in results section results are not clearly mentioned. No in structure tables and graphs of results are given but not statistical results are mentioned, without statistical analysis results are not accepted. Scientifically every method used has a reference, which are not mentioned clearly, instruments and their models are not mentioned, methods of using apparatus is not clear, it has a ambiguity about the actual results. All the references don't carry same style, which is inappropriate, some references are very old, and they should be replaced with recent-ones. In results section statistical results are give with the support is previous studies, but unfortunately statistical methods are not used and not a single reference is used in the supporting of this study, which is technically improper.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language improvement is required	
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Naseem Akhtar
Department, University & Country	Soil Fertility Research Institute Lahore, Pakistan