



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_38966
Title of the Manuscript:	Utilization of corn fibre and pectin gel for the development of low calorie and high fibre biscuits
Type of the 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>)

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 manuscript is well written. However, some sections in the text need to be improved (in grammar and sentences). The author is advised to re-checking the English especially in methodology section. If possible, this manuscript needs to be reviewed by professional proof-reader before re-submission. In addition to this comment, the discussion part need to be critically discussed (not only highlight higher or lower values). For example, the sensory evaluation data were not thoroughly discussed. Same thing to the other sections, all data must be critically discussed.	1. The manuscript has been improved for grammer and sentences 2. The discussion part has been improved as suggested. The sensory evaluation has been discussed separately for the two experimental trials. 3. References have been checked and are according to the journal format. 4. Tables for sensory evaluation for two experimental trials have been separated from the existing tables. the format of tabulation of data in tables is as per journal format
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Please do correction in references section. Most of references are not standardized and not uniform in format. Table for sensory evaluation need to be separated from the existing table. The author also is advised to improve the format of tabulation of data in the Table form.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		