



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJGMB_53626</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Rheology and Acceptance of Pap (Zea mays) Enriched with Jatropha Carcus Leaves to Improve Iron Status in Children</b>
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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<p><b>Reviewer's comment</b> The Title of the manuscript is attractive in terms of improvement in nutritional value of the commonly used cereals particularly for infants and children. The authors have done a reasonable job in terms of experimental work to defend their hypothesis. However, the article reflects the nonprofessional attitude of the authors regarding the data presentation and lacks some necessary information in background and presents some unnecessary and irrelevant literature in Results and Discussion section. Here are some queries which need to be answered before acceptance of the manuscript for publication.</p>	<p><b>Author's comment</b> (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)</p>
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The abstract (340) seems too long w.r.t. the size of the data presented in the article and should be summarized to a suitable size of 200-250 words.</li> <li>2. In previous studies, the <i>Jatropha curcas</i> leaves have been reported to be toxic for nutritional use (Igor PereiraThays C. de CarvalhoWanderson RomãoShow all 8 authorsBoniek G. VazBoniek G. Vaz. Differentiation of Toxic and Non-Toxic Leaves of <i>Jatropha curcas</i> L. Genotypes by Leaf Spray Mass Spectrometry. Journal of the Brazilian Chemical Society 28(8), 2017). The authors have used as a nutritional supplement for enrichment of Iron but they have not given any literature based information about the nutritional quality and toxicity level of <i>Jatropha curcas</i> leaves In introduction section. The required information must be provided.</li> <li>3. In materials and methods section under the Processing of <i>Jatropha curcas</i> Leaves, the authors have written that the leaves were oven dried at 500C. Is it possible or believable to dry the leaves at such a high temperature for two h?</li> <li>4. The authors have selected 70:30 ratios of pap and <i>Jatropha</i> leaves respectively along with the pure ones for preparation of blend but not justified why only 70:30 ratio was selected? It would be better to optimize various ratios to get optimal results.</li> <li>5. In chemical analysis, it would be better to write the references of protocols for various tests in a single paragraph instead of single line text under different headings.</li> <li>6. The equation given for CHO calculation is confusing which must be corrected/clarified.</li> <li>7. The use of units for time, temperature, weight and volume is not uniform and according to the SI unit style.</li> <li>8. All of the equations given for calculation of functional properties are also confusing and must be corrected.</li> <li>9. For determination of viscosity, the authors have set the temperature of boiling water bath at 70-800C and room temperature at 23-250C which is unbelievable/confusing. Similarly the temperature of stirring at 550C, water bath at 900C and separating funnel 250C for determination of saponins is also confusing.</li> <li>10. The formulae for the calculation of Tannins and hydrogen cyanide need to be corrected and the method of calculation of glycosides should be provided.</li> <li>11. In results and discussion section, the authors have given some unnecessary and irrelevant references of the literature to discuss their data which need to be removed and the data should be discussed concisely. Moreover, the authors have presented all of their experimental data in tabular form which somewhat boring for the readers. It would be better to show their significant findings in graphical form.</li> </ol>	



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>12. No conclusive paragraph or statement has been given at the end of the results and discussion section. The conclusions of the study must be given at the end of this section.</p> <p>13. There are numerous grammatical, punctuation and spelling mistakes throughout the manuscript. It is suggested that the manuscript must be checked by an English Language Expert and the mistakes be corrected throughout the manuscript carefully.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Haq Nawaz</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Bahauddin Zakariya University, Pakistan</b>