

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_103846
Title of the Manuscript:	SENSORY STABILITY OF MAIZE GRAINS PRESERVED BY A TRIPLE PACKING SYSTEM AND BIOPESTICIDES (LEAVES OF LIPPIA MULTIFLORA MOLDENKE AND HYPTIS SUAVEOLENS POIT)
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:

(<https://www.journalarrb.com/index.php/ARRB/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. it is interesting because it shows a methodology for conservation of maize. 2. Agree. 3. Agree. 4. yes 5. Some suggestions were mentioned. 6. Agree.</p> <p>Considerations: Abstract: In the sentence "The first factor of the CCP " would be CCD, verified.</p> <p>Material and methods: The variables used in the CCD should be mentioned in the material, to better understand the CCD experimental model used. Indicate the sex and age of the panellists. In the item Calibration and performance of panelists, sample preparation is mentioned, however in item 2.2.2 this preparation was previously mentioned, avoid repeating information.</p> <p>In conclusion: The conclusion must be rewritten. do not resubmit the results. For example, "The results obtained indicated that preserved maize grains develop differently depending on the treatment method. The storage time and the treatment significantly influence its sensory quality during storage. The used of triple bagging systems maintained sensory qualities such as high intensity of sweetness, cooked maize aroma and color uniformity of the porridges produced during storage and while lowering the intensity values of rancid, moldy, astringent and aftertaste aromas during the first nine months of storage. Therefore, the triple bagging system using Lippia multiflora and H. suaveolens leaves as a biopesticide can be used alternatively by the food industry to prolong the sensory stability of grains. This simple and less expensive technology offers products a biodegradable protection that reduces the costs of synthetic preservatives, making it a safer and natural preservative for human health."</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Monica Beatriz Alvarado Soares
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Santa Maria, Brazil