

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.	This manuscript reports the optimization of soaking conditions to enhance the nutritional quality of foxtail millet, its protein, and phytate content under various conditions. Such work is essential to the scientific community and the food processing sectors in promoting millets as sustainable, nutrient-rich staple foods.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is apt because it clearly reflects the focus of the study, which is on the effects of soaking parameters on the protein and phytate content of foxtail millet. A more precise title could be: "Optimization of Soaking Conditions to Enhance Protein and Reduce Phytate Content in Foxtail Millet (<i>Setaria italica</i>)."	
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.	The abstract provides a comprehensive overview of the study's objectives, methodology, results, and conclusions. However, I suggest including a brief mention of the statistical significance of the findings to underscore their scientific robustness.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	structure of the manuscript is well-organized, allowing for clear presentation and logical progression of the research.	
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.	This manuscript is scientifically sound with regard to appropriate experimental and analytical methods in order to accomplish the stated aims. Results are supported by statistical analysis, and comparisons made with literature are insightful. The methodology is well described, thus allowing for reproducibility.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and recent, adequately covering relevant studies. However, including additional references on the commercial applications of enhanced millet products could broaden the study's impact.	
Minor REVISION comments	Ensure consistency of terminology, for example by always using "phytate content" rather than sometimes using "phytic acid." Explain how temperature of soaking time interacts with nutrient retention, and especially for commercial processing applications.	
Optional/General comments	The language is clear and suitable for scholarly communication. Minor proofreading for grammatical consistency, especially in the results section, is recommended.	

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:	Sagar Bhatt
Department, University & Country	UITHM, Chandigarh university, India