



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_47350
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Study of Custard Products with Turmeric (Curcuma longa) and Pawpaw (Carica papaya)
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>Abstract Place and duration of study: This research was carried out at the department of food science and technology laboratory, Owerri Results: the control was much accepted while the pawpaw sample was moderately accepted by the panelist. Conclusion Line 2: has Line 3: than some commercial custard present in Nigeria</p> <p>Introduction Paragraph 1, line 2: remove and before colour remove , after color with the and as well 3: supplement to infant feeding 6: with little quantity of water to form a mixture 7: into the mixture Paragraph 2, line 5: post - harvest 6: their high moisture 7: There is need for more research work to be carried out on the useful application of pawpaw Paragraph 3,line 3: the use of tumeric has been employed in food stuff 4: as spice, it gives 5: used as colouring agent Paragraph 4, line 2: addition of pawpaw 3: add varieties 4: post- harvest 5: meets</p> <p>Sample preparation hours in full Preparation of custard powder air tight</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>2.3 line 1: for the determination 2: determination 2.51 line 6: were inoculated into already prepared sterile PDA plates 8:add to line 7, using the spread plate technique as</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>11: plates were; NA culture plates were</p> <p>3.1.1. ranged</p> <p>3.1.3, line 4: which might be as a result of the protein from pawpaw</p> <p>Line 5: view</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>Reflection on the topic , the topic is incomplete, my opinion is that it should end with to increase or improve the nutritional value</p> <p>Remove all internal borders from tables</p> <p>Stick to one method of preparation, either flow diagrams or by explanation</p> <p>Pictures taken with phones should be labelled as plates while those gotten from the Internet should be properly cited from the sources where they are derived from</p> <p>Result should be separate from discussion</p> <p>Present your result first in tables before discussing on them in discussion section.</p> <p>Discussion should be backed up by previous research carried out on your topic or related to it, to support your claim or otherwise</p> <p>2.5.1 Formula not completed</p> <p>Work more on your references</p>	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Adediwura, Dami Victoria
Department, University & Country	Sokoto State University, Nigeria