

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFRN_121752
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF DRYING TECHNIQUES ON PHYTOCHEMICAL AND VITAMIN COMPOSITIONS OF THREE SPECIES OF AMARANTH
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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is highly relevant to the scientific community, especially in the fields of food science and nutrition. It contributes valuable insights into how different drying methods affect the nutritional quality of Amaranth, a crucial crop known for its health benefits. Understanding these effects is essential for optimizing processing techniques that preserve the maximum nutritional value of the plant. I appreciate this manuscript for its potential to guide both researchers and food processors in enhancing the health benefits of Amaranth, though it would be even stronger if it included a broader analysis of additional factors influencing nutrient retention.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title "Effect of Drying Techniques on Phytochemical and Vitamin Compositions of Three Species of Amaranth" is clear and descriptive, accurately reflecting the content of the manuscript. However, if you wanted to make it more specific or engaging, you could consider an alternative title like:</p> <p>"Impact of Various Drying Methods on the Nutrient and Phytochemical Profiles of Three Amaranth Species"</p> <p>This alternative title emphasizes the comparative nature of the study and highlights the focus on both nutrient and phytochemical retention.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract is comprehensive and provides a clear summary of the study's objectives, methods, and key findings. However, there are a few areas where it could be improved for clarity and readability:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Contextual Introduction: The abstract jumps directly into the study without providing any context. A brief introductory sentence explaining the importance of Amaranth and why the study of drying techniques on its phytochemical and vitamin content is relevant would strengthen the abstract. Simplification of Results: The detailed presentation of the results with specific numeric ranges for each phytochemical and vitamin can be overwhelming in an abstract. Consider summarizing these findings more concisely, perhaps focusing on the general trends rather than specific numbers. Conclusion Emphasis: The conclusion could be made more impactful by highlighting the practical implications of the findings, such as the recommendation for optimal drying methods to preserve nutrients in Amaranth. Minor Language Adjustments: Phrases like "standard operating procedures" and "two-way analysis of variance" is clear, but the abstract could benefit from a slight simplification in language to make it more accessible to a broader audience. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Summary: The conclusion summarizes the findings well, but it could be more impactful by briefly discussing the broader implications of the study. For example, how might these findings influence food processing practices or dietary recommendations?</p> <p>Future Directions: Consider adding a sentence or two about potential future research directions based on your findings.</p> <p>Consistency: Make sure the terminology and style are consistent throughout the manuscript. For instance, the temperature units should be consistent (either use "°C" or "oC" uniformly). Overall, the structure is appropriate, but with some refinements, the manuscript could be more concise, clear, and impactful.</p>	
<p>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</p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound as it employs well-established methods for the extraction and quantification of phytochemicals and vitamins, adhering to standard protocols cited from reputable sources. The experimental design is carefully structured, utilizing a factorial approach that allows for comprehensive analysis of the effects of different</p>	

Review Form 3

for this part.	drying techniques on multiple Amaranthus species. Additionally, the study's results are statistically validated, with appropriate use of mean values and significance testing, ensuring the reliability of the findings. The inclusion of relevant comparisons with existing literature further supports the scientific accuracy and relevance of the research outcomes.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references in the manuscript are generally sufficient and cover a wide range of relevant studies, including foundational works and recent advancements in the field. The inclusion of recent references, such as those from 2022, ensures that the manuscript is up-to-date with the latest research developments. However, while the references provide a solid foundation, there could be a greater emphasis on more recent studies to further enhance the manuscript's relevance and depth. Additionally, the manuscript could benefit from the inclusion of references that specifically address the latest advances in drying techniques and their effects on phytochemical retention, particularly those published within the last five years. This would further strengthen the scientific grounding of the study.	
<u>Minor REVISION</u> comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. The manuscript is clear and concise, with appropriate use of scientific terminology and a logical flow of ideas. However, there may be occasional minor grammatical errors or awkward phrasing that could be improved for better readability and precision.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript presents a thorough investigation and offers valuable insights into the subject matter. The research is well-structured, with a clear introduction, methodology, and discussion. The results are presented in a logical manner, supporting the study's objectives. However, minor revisions in language, formatting, or additional data analysis could further strengthen the manuscript. Overall, it makes a significant contribution to the field and is a strong candidate for publication.	

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:	Hafiz Muhammad Bilawal Akram
Department, University & Country	University of Agriculture, Pakistan