

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_86483
Title of the Manuscript:	Development of pseudo cereal quinoa based gluten free product to manage celiac disease among children
Type of the 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.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	It is an interesting study in which quinoa based gluten free biscuits are proven to be nutritionally superior to those prepared from rice and maize flour. The scientific rationale is explained well and the study is well designed and executed. The report is clear and concise, the conclusions are generally well supported by the data presented. However, the language clearly needs to be improved in some paragraphs.	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>In introduction, page 2, the sentence "The prevalence of celiac disease and latent celiac disease is 8.53, 3.70 out of 1,000 in northern, 4.66, and 3.92/1000 in north-eastern and 0.11, 1.22/1000 in southern part of India" to be replaced by "The prevalence of celiac disease and latent celiac disease is 8.53 - 3.70 out of 1,000 in northern, 4.66 - 3.92/1000 in north-eastern and 1.22 - 0.11/1000 in southern part of India"</p> <p>In introduction, page 2 "Celiac disease prevalence amongst school". Replace amongst with among</p> <p>Page 13, paragraph "Medical history", the authors must correct the mistake in the following: "followed by 30% diagnosis less than six months and 23.33% for less than six months"</p> <p>In Tables II, III, and IV, in the 4th column, it would be more interesting to record the statistical difference (p value) between the 2 groups (2nd and 3rd column) than to record the sum of the 2 groups.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Efstathios Mitsopoulos
Department, University & Country	Papageorgiou General Hospital of Thessaloniki, Greece