

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This article provides important information regarding the quality attributes of development defatted soya flour and Aloe-Vera based functional biscuits. - The title is adequate to the content of the article. - The abstract of the article is well written, adequately explains the research setting and issues. - The Introduction gives a suitable description of the addressed problem and it shows the significance of the research problem. The methodology used is well described and appropriate to the purpose of the research. The results are interesting and important for researchers in relevant areas of agriculture and food industry, but not clearly structured and incomplete. - The purpose or goal of the work is within the journal's scope. - I recommend the inclusion of a larger number of more recent studies on the subject and their insertion in bibliographic references. <p>However, some minor corrections should be made in order to publish the article. Please, take into account the following recommendations to improve this manuscript:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The general presentation of the manuscript should be reviewed, the extra spaces between words or the lack of spaces between titles, subtitles, table and text according to the requirements of the journal; - I recommend a revision of the manuscript according to the requirements of the journal (English, technical editing, bibliography, etc.); - For the publication of this study, I recommend supplementing it with other determinations to support its importance and opportunity; - The presentation of the results obtained from this study is very brief, with few references to other studies with similar results and I recommend a solution to this problem; - For the publication of this study, I recommend supplementing it with other determinations to support its importance and opportunity; - The paragraph Result and Discussion does not include the results obtained for Physical characteristics of Biscuits, Microbiological analysis and Sensory analysis, which are included in Materials and methods. I recommend presenting these results in the form of tables or figures; - In the paragraph Compositional evaluation, results are presented regarding the chemical composition of biscuits, vitamin C and beta-carotene content, analyses that are not included in the paragraph Materials and methods, (the methods used for this purpose are not presented), I recommend correcting this situation; - I recommend that clearer Conclusions be formulated, highlighting the importance of the results obtained. <p>Based on the above mentioned, I recommend this paper for publication after performing the suggested corrections.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	I recommend a carefully check of the full manuscript to correct any grammatical or syntax error.	
Optional/General comments		

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Daniela Stoin
Department, University & Country	University of Life Sciences "King Michael I", Romania