SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Food Science Journal**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AFSJ_56651**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Comparative Studies of Nutritional values of Rough Rice (Oryza sativa) And Jangli Rice(Echinochola colona)**
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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

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. I find work good but manuscript was written very poor. Lots of grammatical mistakes, space problems. Please apply spell check and remove unnecessary spaces in the article.** **2. Abstract was written very poor. Not discussing results of the present finding rather general discussion of food. I tried to improve by writing results myself. Please check and make it more effective.** **3. Methods section: please mention replicates if used. And statistics if applied.** **4. Table was poor in a way that no uniformity of the units. Some values are in g, some in mg, some %. All values should be in one unit so that can be compared between plant materials. I have changed values and put in one unit (g per kg of grains). Check all values for accuracy.** **Rest was okay, that comparison of two plant materials for many biochemicals together in just one run of chromatogram was good. Results were good. Mineral content, fibre content, some essential amino acids were found to be higher in E. colona.** **Rest of the changes are marked on the manuscript.**	Done the revision Corrected Revised Done
Minor REVISION comments		
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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	