

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_127625
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of different soaking parameters on the protein and phytate content of foxtail millet
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the 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

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	It is a good message on how to reduce ANF simply.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Fine, the title suits	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Check for minor grammatical and punctuation.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Almost fine, better to include methodology with method (Methods & Methodology)	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	It is ok in a small work. Would have been good if the work included tannins, protease inhibitors, oxalate content etc. It's ok, phytate served primary ANF. Have you analyzed the protein and phytate contents in the soaking water? If you integrated it, that would have strongly supported your result?	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	It's ok for this small work.	
Minor REVISION comments	Language and grammatical need to be revisited.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) More information on Foxtail Millet may be provided. 2) Mentioned the indicator dye used in the Kjeldahl analysis 3) Mention the concentration of the boric acid solution used in the Kjeldahl analysis 4) Mentioned the indicator dye used in the Kjeldahl analysis 5) Why blank and samples were not run simultaneously in the Kjeldahl analysis? 6) Mention the Whatman filter paper no. used in the phytate analysis. 7) Why variance such as SD is not shown in Tables 1 & 2 respectively 8) In Figure 1, error bars are superimposed. Used different colours to indicate them. 9) Have you analyzed the protein and phytate contents in the soaking water? If you integrated it, that would have strongly supported your result? 	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Baleshwor Sharma
Department, University & Country	College of Agricultural Engineering & Post harvest Technology, Sikkim, Central Agricultural University, Imphal, India