## 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.**<br><br>**I recommend placing, either in the tables or in the graphs or in both, the statistical differences found in the treatments.** | |
| **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.<br><br>Put in the abstract what was the main conclusion of the study | |
| **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)* | |

**Reviewer Details:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Name: | **Horacio Villalon-Mendoza** |
| Department, University & Country | **Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León, México** |