

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_124207
Title of the Manuscript:	Development of Jelly Cake and its Sensory Evaluation by using Millet and Amla
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

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.	The development of gluten-free food products is an important issue with impact for human health. Although the recent decades witnessed the analysis and development of alternatives for gluten-free food products, the issue has shown an important decay in the recent few years. The importance of maintaining studies in this line relies in that gluten-free products important not only for celiacs, but also for general population given the high sensitivity (not necessarily allergenic) to gluten components. The work proposed an an interesting development based on alternative cereals.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, I think the title reflects clearly the nature of the contribution.	
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 requires rewriting. Please, re-structure the abstract as follows: a brief motivation, main methods, salient results and a brief conclusion. By doing this, the reader will be able to assess the importance of the problem and the reported results.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes. In general, the manuscript follows a standard structure of sections and subsections.	
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 offers only marginal results on the issue of gluten-free food product developments. The introduction is very poor in terms of scientific and technological motivation, as well as on literature review and hypothesis to be addressed. The whole introduction requires major work by focusing on the main issue and establishing clearly the antecedents underlying the development and analysis of gluten-free food products. On the other hand, the description of the methodology is very poor to be replicated by others. The results described only the sensory analysis, lacking important issues like texture and molecular organization. The discussion relies more on a subjective narrative rather than on a scientific analysis of the results. Overall, the manuscript requires major restructuration as well as additional experimental work. I suggest carrying out, at least, texture, color and FTIR analyses.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references used in the manuscript are very few given the large number of results on gluten-free food products reported in the literature. It is useless to suggest specific references given the poor discussion of the antecedents discussed in the introduction.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	In general, English is acceptable, although it can be improved by using a software to reduce typos and grammars.	
Optional/General comments	I think the manuscript cannot be recommended for publication. Major writing, experimental, analysis and discussion work is required to conform a manuscript with the minimal standards of a scientific report. I think authors should consult an experimented researcher/professor to obtain help on the writing of science reports. This drawback should not be disappointing for the authors, but rather a motivation for improving their research work.	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jose Alvarez-Ramirez
Department, University & Country	Universidad Autonoma Metropolitana, Mexico