

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_95742
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of physical, chemical and sensory properties of multigrain cookies prepared using wheat, oats and sorghum flours
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:

(<https://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>)

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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The manuscript is interesting. The authors proposed an interesting possibility of replacing wheat flour with other components to obtain a new functional product that would be desirable for those consumers who prefer a lifestyle based on eating gluten-free products or with the lowest possible gluten content.</p> <p>Yes. The title of the article corresponds to its content.</p> <p>Yes. The summary of the article is satisfactory.</p> <p>Yes. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. However, some of them require supplementing with additional information.</p> <p>1. Was the energy content of the samples determined by Nielsen, or did the authors determine it in accordance with the procedure described by Nielsen?</p> <p>2. Please provide a more detailed description of the preparation of the cookies. What devices were used to obtain them? What was the baking time? Were they analyzed immediately after baking or after some period of storage?</p> <p>3. Please provide information who carried out the sensory evaluation of the cookies? Was it an expert panel or was there a specific research group involved in this study?</p> <p>In the manuscript, the authors included information on the research problem undertaken. After conducting the research, the obtained results were collected in tables and figures. They discussed them and had a short discussion.</p> <p>The references are sufficient.</p> <p>Please check the entire manuscript for word clusters? The conclusion needs to be shortened. There should be no numerical data, which should rather be presented in the "Results and Discussion" section.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I have no additional 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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mariola Kozłowska
Department, University & Country	Warsaw University of Life Sciences, Institute of Food Sciences, Poland