

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Applied Chemistry Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJACR_82948
Title of the Manuscript:	Physico-chemical, functional and antioxidant properties of some flours types as gluten-free ingredients compared to wheat flour
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajacr.com/index.php/AJACR/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Results 3.1 last paragraph- You say wheat showed the highest value of calories, but when comparing to most, it is not significant. I believe this should be stated.</li> <li>Results: 3.3; in discussion of protein solubility, you should mention these was not a significant difference between them. Then discuss what this means to a GF product.</li> <li>Results: 3.3; paragraph 6 discusses foams. Chickpea liquid, known as "aquafaba" is used as an egg replacer because of its foaming properties. Bringing this into the discussion would enhance the explanation of the different properties it has.</li> <li>Results: 3.3; To tie your findings together, your paper would benefit on how these properties affect GF products, since that is how you introduced the importance of this study. E.g. when gluten is removed, GF products perform more like gluten containing one when extra protein is added.</li> <li>Last paragraph you call rice, millet, chickpeas seeds. I don't view rice as a seed, but quinoa can be considered a seed.</li> </ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grammar: 2.2.3 Samples "was" should be "were; 2.2.4.3 with constant "starring" should be "stirring"</li> <li>Grammar: Results 3.2; In the second paragraph you use "such as" twice in the same sentence. A little repetitive</li> </ul>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>You paper just needs more depth in tying your results to GF baking qualities.</li> </ul>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Karen Breshears</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Central Missouri, USA</b>