

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_126127
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutritional and Bioactive properties of composite flour made from hempseed and corn silk for formulation of fibre and protein rich paratha
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.	Research is important to the society and scientific. Paratha is consumed daily in every home so the incorporation of corn silk and hemp seed give nutritional benefits (bioactive compounds) to society and providing the scientific data for researchers and value addition. The manuscript is like because of all the properties are study properly and results shows the positive impact of ingredients which are added in different prorations.	We appreciate the reviewer's positive comments regarding the importance of our research to both society and the scientific community. Thank you for acknowledging the scientific value and societal relevance of our work.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	Thank you.
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.	In abstract, if possible, please write the ANOVA i.e CCD or CCRD used and numbers of experiment. CCD- Central Composite Design CCRD- Central Composite Rotatable Design	The details are mentioned in methodology already.
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes Correct	Thank You.
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 is scientifically and technically is correct because the topic choose wisely, variables are different as per topic requirement. Scientifically the data analysis is done and that shows in result and technically the ANOVA use correctly.	We are pleased that the correct application of ANOVA in the analysis was noted. Thank you for acknowledging the scientific rigor and technical soundness of the manuscript.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes Correct	Thank you
Minor REVISION comments		We are glad for your acknowledgements.
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	No	

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>	