

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_CJAST_102230</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Calcium and magnesium rich cookies, fortified with pumpkin(Cucurbita moschata) and sunflower seed(Helianthus annus L.)</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Functional Foods are of great interest in the food world. Seeing the possibilities of ingredients is always interesting.</b></li> <li>2. <b>Title is appropriate</b></li> <li>3. <b>Abstract needs work. You have repetitive sentences, or information that could just be in the methods section (how you ground the seed flour), you mentioned 5 samples, while you actually had 14., to name a few items that need to be adjusted.</b></li> <li>4. <b>Subsections: under methods need a section on the microbial tests, and you should have some statistical tests run (significance) and there should be a section on that. In your results and discussion, you need more discussion as the whys and importance of the information you provided.</b></li> <li>5. <b>I believe the manuscript is scientifically correct, just not well supported.</b></li> <li>6. <b>The references are sufficient and fairly recent. I know it isn't always easy to find all current sources.</b></li> <li>7. <b>Additional comments:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>You made a claim in the abstract that the cookies were rich in antimicrobial and antioxidant property and rich I protein. You did not really show this except for the information you found on the seeds you incorporated.</b></li> <li>• <b>You need to have consistency in the number of cookies you tested (14) throughout the paper. There is nothing wrong with admitting you made 14 formulations. You do need to contain the results for all of them is you are listing that many in the table (sensory results for example). It would be helpful to have a clearer understanding of the sensory process, how many judges you had, etc.</b></li> <li>• <b>In Material and Methods-</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>The size of the sieve could be listed.</b></li> <li>○ <b>Take the boxes off from around your items in figure 1. And there shouldn't be color around the Figure 1 title.</b></li> <li>○ <b>The Fourier Transform-Infrared Spectroscopy- you have failed to show why this test was important to your cookie production. Why are the types of bonds important? I would just leave this test out.</b></li> <li>○ <b>But you do need to add how you completed your microbial test.</b></li> <li>○ <b>I highly recommend some statistical analysis (and hence a section on it) to show the significance of the changes in the microbial count between room temperature and refrigeration. And in all your results.</b></li> <li>○ <b>Your chemical composition should be compared to the standard cookie (T0) and significance in differences found.</b></li> <li>○ <b>Your mineral content should be compared to the standard (T0). For this and the above, you haven't proved that there was a change in these nutrients.</b></li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Results</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Put your Table 4 and 5 together so the results can be compared and then have the significant difference between them found. Otherwise you can't really claim that refrigeration was the better method. Maybe there wasn't a significant difference and both storage methods are adequate.</b></li> <li>○ <b>Cost of production is not integral to the goal of the research. It could be deleted. If you keep it, the methods on how you calculated this should be in the Methods sections.</b></li> <li>○ <b>In 3.5 at the end you state that the overall acceptability for T4 was 8.5, but you table shows it is 9. Be consistent. In fact, having decimals in Table 6 would be appropriate, along with Standard deviation.</b></li> <li>○ <b>You need more discussion for each are of the cookie you give results for. You could better show the significance of the results.</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ol>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Conclusion:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ You haven't shown the cookies were more nutritionally dense because you didn't show us what the standard was to compare it to.</li> <li>○ You claim the cookies are safe to eat- how did you come to that conclusion? Microbial count?</li> <li>○ Your final statement would be better to say which nutrients the cookies are higher in rather than a blanket statement of being "healthier".</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>1. Your English needs some work. For example sentence two of the abstract tells us the main goal, but so does sentence three. Use one or the other. You have some awkward sentences. E.g. Your second sentence in the Abstract has the use of "which" three times. Makes for an awkward sentence.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>I really do like to see functional foods being developed, which is why I chose to review this manuscript. You have great potential, but need some refining.</p>	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Karen Breshears</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Central Missouri, USA</b>