

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_106453
Title of the Manuscript:	Protein quality characterization of defatted white sesame cake and its protein isolate
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.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>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>	<p>Yes. But write briefly</p> <p>Change as scientifically</p> <p>very short and not covered all the research points.</p> <p>Methodology: Concise but lacking the information regarding citation of estimation methodology. This is very primitive work may be some statistical approach should be applied for fruitful work.</p> <p>Discussion : a) Not discussed in depth b) Not written at all. It should be written as- c) Compare your result with other work d) Why your work is important, and so on...</p> <p>Conclusion: must concludes the results in proper manner.</p> <p>References : more and recent references should be include, references not as the instructions for authors Not uniform style and lack of information Rewrite the reference as mentioned in the guideline provided by the journal. Full manuscript should be in format as per given journal instruction</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The paper needs thorough revision. Discussion of the results should be increase. Relevance and number of citations are needed. Spelling error mentioned in manuscript in red colour</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The number of words in abstract exceeded what is in the instructions for Authors. No Pages numbering. Rewrite the reference as mentioned in the guideline provided by the journal. Full manuscript should be in format as per given journal instruction Citation in the text should be [1], to [21], so, organize sequentially</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:	N. Prabhu
Department, University & Country	Vivekanandha College of Engineering for Women, India