

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_120226
Title of the Manuscript:	Environmental Waste Management Practice: Effect of Debittered-Defatted Orange Seed Flour on the Proximate, Anti-nutritional and Sensory Properties of Biscuit
Type of the 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://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

### Review Form 3

#### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript utilises sweet orange seeds, which is byproduct. Using these byproducts in any existing food products can valorise sweet orange. This can also increase the farmers income indirectly.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Term 'Environmental Waste Management Practice:' is unnecessary. Rest is okay.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Abstract is comprehensive and providing the summary of study in detail.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is generally robust and technically sound. However, some sections are not as per quality of academia writing. For example, Introduction unable to convey discussion on why we should go for orange seeds (what are nutritional background so we can use it in biscuits). In materials and methods, Analysis of Antinutrients should be written in detail, so anyone can repeat these experiments. In other analysis, please include parameters like temperature, time, etc. There is no information about proximate composition and antinutritional composition of debittered orange seed flour.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	No. Most of the references are very old. Please use studies published in last decade. Replace these references – 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 27, 33	
Minor REVISION comments  Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, it is acceptable.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	s2.3 – what authors mean by 'The best acceptable debittered orange'. There is no optimization here.	

#### PART 2:

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>	

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yogesh Kumar
Department, University & Country	Sant Longowal Institute of Engineering and Technology, India