



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_42367
Title of the Manuscript:	DEVELOPMENT OF OHMIC HEATING MODEL FOR PARBOILING OF PADDY
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 (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	In the title it is suggested to change the word "paddy" by the scientific name "Oryza sativa L." In the "Study Design" section, the location and duration of the study were not mentioned. In the section "Introduction": it is suggested to discuss the process of pre-gelatinization (parboiling). In "Methodology": The number of samples used is not described, it is necessary to exchange the term "parboiled rice" with "pregelatinized rice" because it is a technical term related to this processing. Another important aspect to be analyzed in the study is the absence of chemical composition analyzes for the verification of minerals, starch and fatty acids as these substances undergo changes during heating. Another pending point is in relation to the absence of the gelatinization temperature data due to its influence on the electric conversion model in these foods. The determination of acidity and texture analysis could have been performed. In "Resolutions and Discussions": There is a lack of correlation with other works carried out in the area and related literature, mainly regarding time and temperature, since they are mentioned in the conclusion.	
Minor REVISION comments	In the section of keywords is necessary to make the exchange because they are also present in the title, I suggest the following words: electric conversion; cereals; gelatinization. In the abstract you should remove the frame, it is not necessary. In the "Conclusion", remove the term "Summary", it is not part of that section of a scientific article.	
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vera Lúcia Viana do Nascimento
Department, University & Country	Department of Information, Environment, Health and Food Production, Federal Institute of Piauí-Campus Teresina Central, Brazil