

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_84981
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of temperature and variety on rehydration parameters and solute loss during soaking of maize
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	Comment in the methodology the harvest dates (month and year) of the corn grains for each variety, so that it is not a relevant factor in the results. I recommend placing, either in the tables or in the graphs or in both, the statistical differences found in the treatments.	The harvest dates (month and year) of the corn grains were not a relevant factor in the results therefore were not stated in the study The recommendation is well noted. However, I am not clear about how I can place the statistical difference in the tables or in the graphs since the work was meant to establish a trend for the effect of temperature and variety on solute loss of the variety studied and therefore unable to do it now.
Minor REVISION comments	In the conclusions where it says "The pores in the structure of the maize were responsible for the initial rapid absorption of water by the grains and the hydration of the constituents of the dry matter such as proteins, starch and carbohydrate molecules were responsible of the variation in the rehydration ratio and the values of the rehydration coefficient of the two varieties", I recommend to say that "they could be responsible", instead of "were responsible", since this result is not part of the objectives of the study, nor is in the methodology to measure the pores and study them. Or just delete that conclusion from this section of the document and it stays in results, as it is there. Put in the abstract what was the main conclusion of the study	The portion of the conclusion that says "the pores in the structure of the maize were responsible for the initial rapid absorption of water by the grains and the hydration of the constituents of the dry matter such as proteins, starch and carbohydrate molecules were responsible of the variation in the rehydration ratio and the values of the rehydration coefficient of the two varieties" has been deleted as suggested. The main conclusion of the study has now been included in the abstract
Optional/General comments	Very good research work	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	There were no ethical issues presented in this manuscript.