



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Advances in Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_38718
Title of the Manuscript:	REVIEW ON NUTRITIONAL IMPORTANCE OF CHIPS MADE FROM POTATO (Solanum tuberosum L.)
Type of the Article	Review Paper

**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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/30/editorial-policy>)



**SDI 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript presents a review about chips made from potato (<i>Solanum tuberosum</i> L) focused on nutritional, technological and sensory aspects. The review presents relevant information but it must be improved in order to be published at a high standard journal.</p> <p>A good review should include recent advances in the topic discussed. In general, I observed lack of new studies cited in this review. I understand that the topic is not absolutely new, but there are new studies in the area that could be better explored.</p> <p>Besides, the title does not synthesize the purpose of the review. The nutritional aspects of chips made from potatoes are only discussed in the introduction. Therefore, I understand that the paper should improve the nutritional aspects discussion or change the title in order to include sensory aspects that are mainly discussed.</p> <p>In addition, several changes suggested below may improve the manuscript quality.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Line 6: Replace "solanum tuberosum l." by "Solanum tuberosum L"</li> <li>- Line 25: The phrase "This figure exceeded only by wheat, maize and rice [4]." could be removed since it repeats the idea already presented at line 22.</li> <li>- Line 40: replace "significance" by "significant"</li> <li>- Line 66: replace "pretreatment" by "pretreatments"</li> <li>- Line 87: replace "us" by "as"</li> <li>- Line 93: The phrase "Several oils can be used for frying potato chips, including soybean oil, palm oil, and safflower or groundnut oil." is out of context at this point. If the intention was connecting this oils to the composition of chips, a proper sentence connector should be used. I recommend the authors to rewrite this sentence in order to make sense.</li> <li>- Line 94: remove "of"</li> <li>- Line 95: remove extra comma</li> <li>- Line 95: vitamins B1 and B5 are cited twice</li> <li>- Line 118: replace "isthe" by "is the"</li> <li>- Line 119: remove "of"</li> <li>- Line 122: check reference format.</li> <li>- Line 122: remove "of"</li> <li>- Lines 122 and 123: The phrase "It is one of the most important factors of that contribute to favourable mouth feel and consumer acceptance in the sensory evaluation" is repeated twice in the text.</li> <li>- Lines 123-125: The phrase "Potato chips processing requires tubers with dry matter content of greater or equal to 20% and specific gravity of greater or equal to 1.080" is also repeated twice in the text.</li> <li>- Lines 145-147: This discussion is out of context at this point of the paper. It could be better placed at the beginning of the "colour" topic</li> <li>- Lines 149-156: The topic "Texture" is too short. It is an important parameter for potato chips and could be better explored.</li> <li>- Line 159: replace "glykoalkaloids" by "glycoalkaloids"</li> <li>- Lines 160-168: Why the hardness is discussed in the item "bitterness"? It is completely out of context. In general, the topic "bitterness" is discussing the hardness and not the bitterness itself. If there is lack of information in the literature about this topic, it should be removed or included in the topic "flavour" since it may be considered a flavour defect.</li> </ul>	Noted



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Line 176: replace "backed" by "baked"</li> <li>- Line 187: replace "payridines" by "pyridines"</li> <li>- Line 210: replace "in activate" by "inactivate"</li> <li>- Line 226: replace "glykoalkaloids" by "glycoalkaloids"</li> </ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Line 40: replace "high quality" by "high-quality"</li> <li>- Line 49: replace "market oriented" by "market-oriented"</li> <li>- Line 203: replace "water soluble" by "water-soluble"</li> </ul>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>The paper is well written. However, I strongly suggest the authors to consider the inclusion of more recent references. This could improve the paper relevance by adding recent advances in the area.</p> <p>Besides, the manuscript has several issues that should be addressed to be published at a high standard journal as already mentioned.</p>	