

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Food Science Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_83872
Title of the Manuscript:	Chemical Characterization of Solutions from Cooked Maize and Their Comparison with solutions from cooked beans: Their position between food and Fertilizer
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

### **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	The language of the abstract was not clear and the different elements of a standard abstract were not clearly stated. Materials and methods did not follow any scientific procedure. Results and discussion were not properly arranged. They were cumbersome and the language was difficult to understand. The author should pay close attention to the reviewer's comments and effect the corrections.	The abstract was reviewed according to the remarks. Concerning Materials and Methods, few readjustments have been made; the other portions of that part of the manuscript have been maintained since they present the different informations awaited. Results and discussion can be associated or separated. Here, I preferred to disjoint them. Thanks for the different remarks. They have been integrated in the manuscript.
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Adhere strictly to the journal's format of article presentation	Ok!
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The author should use appropriate language in the write up.	Sorry for my low proficiency. I will continue working hard in other to improve it.

### **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>	