



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_34139
Title of the Manuscript:	Development and nutritional evaluation of cereal and pulse based biscuits for diabetic patients
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some corrections must be done. - Author must polish the English style. - Give details of method of preparation of biscuit. - Sensory analysis were not clear. Rewrite this part. - Justify the paragraph of nutritional analysis - <i>In the title of "Ethical Issues" change "blood glucocse" as "blood glucose"</i> - <i>In glycemic index test which biscuit sample did you use, and give details why did you choose that.</i> - "Bitter taste and burnt flavor in biscuits supplemented with 10g β-glucan was observed" did you determine the β-glucan? - Give the statistically differences in table with alphabetic order. - In table 4, <i>change "protei" as "protein"</i> 	<p>-As said corrections has been done.</p> <p>-An effort has been made to improve English style.</p> <p>-Details have been added.</p> <p>-An effort has been made to make sensory analysis part more clear.</p> <p>-It has been done.</p> <p>-The said changes have been corrected.</p> <p>-The details have been given.</p> <p>-Different author conducted this study and we just quoted it as a reference. As it is creating confusion so it has been removed.</p> <p>-The statistical differences in table 3 and 4 are given with alphabetic order.</p>
Optional/General comments	The conclusion of my review is that minor revisions are required.	