

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Biotechnology Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJI_122426
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of fermentation time with <i>Bacillus subtilis</i> ATCC 6051 on nutrients, antinutrients and antioxidant potential of seeds black red flour lima bean (<i>Phaseolus Lunatus</i>)
Type of the Article	Original research paper

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.	The author carried the research work systematically, completely novel and employed conventional and modern methods. The study promotes that fermented food of Lima seeds produces proteins, dietary fibers, anti-oxidants in presence of <i>Bacillus subtilis</i> . Those essential contents are very useful to human body to fight against pathogens and boost immune system and also for other cellular functions. Furthermore, the study demonstrates a reduction in antinutritional variables, which is a positive outcome.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is Appropriate. The evaluation tests prove the increased/ decreased nutritional, anti-nutritional contents during fermentation.	
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.	Yes, it is comprehensive, and I suggest that the author should correct sentence as antinutritional factors were decreased instead of increase after fermentation (Line 5 of the methodology in abstract) and also correct that meaning of Line 4 (thanks) in objective.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, they are appropriate.	
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.	The author employed a statistical model to establish the relevance of the influence of fermentation time on the antinutritive factors, bioactive phenolic compounds, and antioxidant capacity of lima bean flour. The methodology was clearly defined by the author and it was appropriate for the research question, secondly the data analysis was statistically validated ($p < 0.05$), clearly presented and interpreted. Lastly, the manuscript was including a comprehensive review of relevant literature, demonstrating how the study builds on existing knowledge and addresses any gaps.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient, but the author needs to add few recent references.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1) The author have to put 1.INTRODUCTION instead of 1-INTRODUCTION2) Better to mention fermentation hours (0, 24, 48, 72 hr) in methodology of proximate analysis.3) Need to put (AgNO₃) in 2.4 Anti-nutritional factors estimation of P1 of L5.4) Need tab space for P3 in 2.4 Anti-nutritional factors estimation.5) Instead of "RESULTS AND DISCUSSION" the author wrote 3. Results in lower case.6) Expression of sub side heading order was missing in methodology and results (In methodology the order is 2.3 Proximate analysis, 2.4 Anti-nutritional factors estimation, 2.5 Mineral content analysis but in results mineral composition results after biochemical composition there is a mineral composition results)7) Citation was not mentioned in 2.58) All citations are in bold better to change normal.9) On y-axis in Fig 3 missing of an axis title is "Total flavonoids contents"10) A language error in Fig4 on X-axis.11) Significant value P<0.05 should be italics "<i>p</i> < .05" where ever they mentioned.12) Suggested to check all the references and should maintain a common format according to the Journal template.	

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:	Anand Kumar
Department, University & Country	St. Ann's College of Pharmacy, India