

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_100632
Title of the Manuscript:	Quality Attributes of Development Defatted Soya Flour and Aloe-Vera Based Functional Biscuits
Type of the Article	Review 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.journalafsj.com/index.php/AFSJ/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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, 65%.</p> <p>2. Yes.</p> <p>3. The overall clarity of the abstract is good. It provides a clear overview of the study's objective, methodology, and key findings. However, there are a few areas where further clarification or refinement could enhance the clarity:</p> <p>3.1 The sentence "To prepare the composite flour, defatted soya flour, rice bran has been incorporated with refined wheat flour (Maida) in different proportion and then it was fortified with aloe vera gel at levels from 5 to 20% each" could be rephrased for better clarity. Consider breaking it down into two sentences for better readability.</p> <p>3.2 The sentence "The proximity composition and sensory evaluation of biscuits with 10%, 20%, and 30% aloe vera were studied to determine the optimal formulation" might have a typo, as "proximity composition" doesn't seem to be the intended term. Clarifying the intended meaning of this phrase would improve the clarity of the sentence.</p> <p>3.3 The sentence "Protein enrichment of biscuit satisfies the demand for a higher content of the nutrient, because these product tend to have lower content of protein (7-10%)" could benefit from some restructuring for better clarity. The use of "because" seems a bit unclear in connecting the first and second parts of the sentence.</p> <p>3.4 It would be helpful to provide more specific details about the functional attributes of aloe vera gel and how it contributes to the improvement of the quality of the food product. Adding a sentence or two elaborating on these attributes would enhance the clarity of the abstract.</p> <p>4. Introduction: Based on the current content of the introduction, I would estimate that it meets approximately 60-70% of the standards of introduction writing. While it provides some relevant information about the topic, such as the significance of a healthy diet, the historical background of aloe vera, and its potential applications in food, there are areas that could be improved to enhance the clarity and structure of the introduction. These areas include providing a clear research objective or question, organizing the information into distinct sections, using specific and relevant citations, and ensuring smooth transitions between ideas.</p> <p>5. Overall, based on the information provided in this paper, it does not appear to contain any glaring scientific inaccuracies.</p> <p>6. add more recent references (5-7).</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	None.	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ameel Mohammed Al-Mayah
Department, University & Country	Al-Khwarizmi College of Engineering, University of Baghdad, Iraq