

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_82606
Title of the Manuscript:	UTILIZATION OF POLYSACCHARIDES EXTRACTED FROM TOFU PROCESSING WASTEWATER FOR MICROENCAPSULATION PROCESSES IN THE FOOD INDUSTRY
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.journalafsj.com/index.php/AFSJ/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Dear Authors</p> <p>After a careful review, the following comments are added to your manuscript for improvement of the quality.</p> <p>1. The manuscript needs to be polished by an English native speaker to remove the grammatical errors throughout the manuscripts.</p> <p>2. It is absolutely essential you use the most recent papers in your manuscript. Unfortunately, you have employed older references and also the number of references is very low for a research article.</p> <p>3. The discussion section is not highlighted very well in your manuscript and it needs to review the previous research to reveal that what novelties are used in this study compared with others.</p> <p>4. The results also need to be revised and expanded. You need to use more tables and especially figures. Your current data is not sufficient to show the novelty of your work. It does not motivate the reviewers to read the manuscript when data has nothing to bring.</p> <p>5. The material and methods are written briefly and need to be expanded.</p> <p>6. In your opinion, what are the new aspects of this study compared with previous studies.? A huge amount of earlier research has investigated the role of hydrogels and nanoparticles on the viability of probiotics. The prior studies have investigated very well the effect of the hydrogels on the bacteria compared with your studies.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The authors have tried to make some relevant grammatical corrections2. The references used in this manuscript are both old and recent (2021). This is because there seems to be a common thread running through the old and recent references in terms of the research under review.3. We believe that discussion is appropriate with respect to the objectives of the research. The use of Polysaccharides extracted from tofu processing wastewater in microencapsulation processes in the food industry has not been reported before.4. The results result reported in this study are adequate with respect to the topic under review. We believe that the data provided are in line with the objectives of the study.5. We quite agree with the reviewer’s comment and we promise to take his comments in to consideration for further studies.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	