

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_124564
Title of the Manuscript:	Physical Quality of Edible Film with The Addition of Whey Protein Isolate
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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 addresses the innovative use of whey protein isolate in the development of edible films, which is crucial for advancing sustainable packaging alternatives in the food industry. The study is timely given the increasing demand for biodegradable materials that reduce environmental impact. The experimental approach adopted by the authors could contribute significantly to the scientific community's understanding of how whey protein interacts with other components to enhance film properties. Overall, the manuscript aligns well with current trends in food packaging research and offers valuable insights into edible film production.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title reflects the study well, indicating the investigation of whey protein isolate's (WPI) effect on the physical properties of edible film. However, it could benefit from a more precise scope, such as specifying the exact physical properties being examined (e.g., solubility, thickness, etc.).	
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 would benefit from the inclusion of more quantitative data. For example, if whey protein isolate improved tensile strength or flexibility, mention those specific improvements with corresponding numerical values. This will make the abstract more informative and appealing to readers.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The logical flow of sections, from introduction to methodology, results, and discussion, is well-organized and easy to follow.	
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 manuscript appears to be scientifically robust. The authors have presented a clear methodology and have conducted appropriate experiments to analyze the physical properties of the edible film. The statistical analysis is well-explained and supports the conclusions drawn. The study is technically sound, with clear experimental controls and variables, making it a credible contribution to the field.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	Should be re-checked for the appropriate referencing style. The references are sufficient, but a few more recent studies could be added to strengthen the literature review. Consider incorporating works that focus on recent advances in biodegradable films and food packaging materials published within the last five years.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is generally good, but there are minor grammatical issues that should be addressed. Some sentences could be restructured to improve clarity. I recommend a thorough review of the manuscript for minor language improvements, especially in the introduction and discussion sections.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript presents an interesting study that could provide valuable insights for both academia and industry. The experimental design is appropriate, and the findings are well-documented. I recommend a few minor revisions, particularly to enhance the abstract and polish the language, but overall, it is a well-executed study.	

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:	Jyoti Trivedi
Department, University & Country	Autonomous Government State Medical College, India