

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_106453</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Protein quality characterization of defatted white sesame cake and its protein isolate</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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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> <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. The use of defatted protein isolate in new products is interesting.</p> <p>2. Accordingly</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Accordingly</p> <p>5. as "Original Research Article" further testing could be carried out. Only one extraction method used as a reference was tested. There is a flour and its protein isolate that were evaluated using a methodology. How could extraction be improved...</p> <p>6. Agree</p> <p>Some suggestions and considerations:</p> <p>Methods: Item 2.3, indicate the granulometry of the sesame flour.</p> <p>Results: In the study, a method described in the literature was used. Other tests were carried out to evaluate different pH values or other parameters... Only one test was carried out. Were there preliminary tests?? For example, the authors mention that pH influences extraction, only one pH value was tested. If you have preliminary tests, these could be mentioned. If possible, place the figures separately or as mentioned.</p> <p>Conclusion: Rewrite the conclusion, do not present the results again. Respond according to the proposed objective and highlight the importance of the results obtained.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> 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