Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Applied Chemistry Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJACR_84527
Title of the Manuscript:	Physico-Chemical, Functional and Antioxidant Evaluation of Some Gluten-free Flours Formulas Compared with Available Commercial Formula
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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.journalajacr.com/index.php/AJACR/editorial-policy)

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		The resultation results and results and results and results are results and results and results are results and results and results are results are results are results and results are results are results and results are results are results and results are re
	The article is well written and has been covered the evaluation of some gluten-free	
	flours formulas for physio-chemical, functional, and antioxidant properties in	
	comparison to commercially available formulas.	
	 Both additions and corrections were outlined in red color. 	
	Many of the words outlined in blue should be deleted.	
	Keywords: Please re arrange key words alphabetically.	
Minor REVISION comments		
	It is better to standardize the names of journals in references and write them as a	
	standard abbreviation for journals. The author(s) can check the shortcut at	
	http://images.webofknowledge.com/WOK46/help/WOS/T_abrvjt.html or	
	www.journalseek.net etc	
	❖ Grammar: Need Some revision.	
Optional/General comments	. In general, the paper is well written, and the manuscript is relevant and informative	
	❖ In general, the paper is well written, and the manuscript is relevant and informative. The study concluded that when compared to CE commercial formulae, prepared	
	The study concluded that when compared to GF commercial formulas, prepared GF flours formulas had improved nutritional value as well as improved physical	
	characteristics.	
	 Title: the title properly explains the purpose and objective of the article 	
	Abstract: The abstract offers an accurate summary of the paper, and the language used in the abstract is easy to read and understand.	
	Introduction: The authors provide sufficient context on the subject and purpose of	
	this study, as well as a description of the authors' goals.	
	* Results: The findings are presented clearly, the authors provide reliable test	
	results, and each finding is supported by adequate proof.	
	Conclusion: The research offers sample data for the authors to draw conclusions	
	from.	

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

		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:	Manal Hadi Ghaffoori Kanaan
Department, University & Country	Technical Institute of Suwaria, Middle Technical University, Iraq

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)