

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_112808
Title of the Manuscript:	CHEMICAL AND FUNCTIONAL PROPERTIES OF WHEAT, ORANGE POMACE AND MANGO KERNEL FLOURS AND THEIR BLENDS.
Type of the Article	

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript is a first step towards the start of an investigation into the characterization of unconventional flours obtained from agroindustry waste or by-products in order to provide information for possible food uses. The manuscript requires some adaptations so that the reader can have a better understanding of the research proposal.</p> <p>2. I think the title represents the proposal of the work well, but it could be adjusted to make it more scientific. Title suggestion: <b>Blends of wheat, orange pomace and mango kernel flours: chemical, functional and anti-nutritional properties</b></p> <p>3. The abstract needs few adjustments. My suggestions follow in the manuscript comments.</p> <p>4. The structure of the manuscript is good. With only a few reservations regarding the section title and organization of the subjects covered. Comments are in the original file.</p> <p>5. The manuscript needs some adaptations to have a more appropriate scientific context. My suggestions are in the comments of the Word file.</p> <p>7. Around 30% of references are from research from the last 5 years. Some references that are more than 10 years old could be updated.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>It would be interesting for the text to be revised in terms of language, in general. Mainly in relation to technical and scientific terms.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Some adaptations and doubts need to be resolved and clarified so that the manuscript has more solid scientific characteristics. The statistical part, both planning (design) and analysis, needs to be brought into the work. I recommend that the manuscript only be published if the suggested changes are made.</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>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Alline Emannuele Chaves Ribeiro</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Federal University of Goiás, Brazil</b>