

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFRN_121860
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutritional evaluation of biscuit fortified with psyllium husk, oat flour and sweet lupine powder
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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.	With rise in metabolism and nutrient related disorders like obesity, CVD, diabetes etc., effective approaches are necessary to overcome them. Formulating a product that are acceptable by consumers as well have high nutritional benefits can have a significant importance in the scientific community. I loved that the researcher tried to be creative and formulated a product that taste good as well as provide enormous health benefits. But the author must work on the writing part and explain his work and possible future implication in concise manner.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, I believe that the title of the article is suitable	
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 is not very comprehensive. Same words are repeated several times. You can also separate using the subsection in abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes heading, subsection and structure of manuscript is 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.	Yes, I believe that the materials, methods and result obtained are scientifically correct. Little more work is needed in discussion section linking the findings with past works and stating the possible reasons for the outcome.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	I believe the references are appropriate for the work done so far. Author might need to add more reference with the correction in the discussion part.	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	I think there are a lot of errors regarding communication. Author must work seriously on those errors. I also suspected the use of paraphrasing tool that might have made the sentence difficult to understand and unclear at several points.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Usha Gartoula
Department, University & Country	University of Roehampton, London