



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_36963
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of processing on Nutritional, Organoleptic quality, and Storage Stability of Cowpea (Vigna unguiculata (L).Walp)
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:

(<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	-	
Minor REVISION comments	This manuscript describe a technically sound piece of scientific research providing valuable information about the changes that occur in the nutritional and organoleptic properties as well as in the storage stability of the cowpea variety Pant Lobia-5 in order to identify the best processing technique that may be taken up for commercialization. It can be mentioned the following important points that have been considered: - The title of the paper and the abstract are clear; - The Introduction section provides a clear statement of the problem and the presented literature is relevant for this topic; - The experiments are properly conducted, the figures and tables are correct, clear and understandable and the presentation of the paper is technically correct; - The results are adequately discussed and interpreted; - The paper contains a sufficient number of references related to the topic; all references mentioned in the References are cited in the manuscript and <i>vice versa</i>. Recommendations: Please, rewrite the conclusions section. This part has to be more briefly, without repeating what you've already mentioned in the core of the manuscript. This section has to summarize the results and discussions, showing only essential information that result from the obtained results. I also recommend a carefully check of the full manuscript to correct any grammatical error or syntax error.	The following corrections have been made as per suggestions of the reviewer. All corrections have been highlighted in Yellow. 1. The conclusion has been rewritten to make it more brief and avoid repetition. 2. The manuscript has been rechecked for grammatical and syntax error.
Optional/General comments	-	