Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_CJAST_41901**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Nutritional evaluation of cereal-pulse based extruded snacks supplemented with dehydrated herbs.**
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	The format of text from abstract to result and discussion section is completely different from other text. Because of wrong format, it can't be easy to understand this. So, kindly correct them accordingly as per journal guidelines.	
Minor REVISION comments	**Minor Comments:** 1. From line no. 5 to 149 the format of text is completely different from next one. So, kindly correct them accordingly as per journal guidelines. 2. From line no. 5 to 149 because of wrong format, it can't be easy to understand this. 3. Also, justified the text from line no. 5 to 149 4. In Abstract portion at conclusion section remove non word from here. 5. In line no. 97 use only material and methods instead of all. MATERIAL AND METHODS / EXPERIMENTAL DETAILS / METHODOLOGY 6. In line no. 103 correct the genus name with lowercase instead of uppercase. 7. In line no. 118 why only in duplicates?? 8. In line no. 121 correct the word Ascorbic Acid as ascorbic acid. 9. In line no. 135 -136 and 140-141 kindly mention the detail of method used. 10. From line no 150 in results and discussion section kindly give the resulted values with standard error or standard deviation in whole manuscript as given in tables. 11. Results represented in line no. 316-318 are not related with the data shown in table 5. Kindly check and correct. 12. In line no 308 and 309, author represents the data as mg/100gm but in table it was represented as mg RE/100gm. Which one is final? 13. In line no. 311-12 How can you calculate the ranged of percentage from 78 to 207????? 14. What is the reason in increase of TAC and others?? Also correlated with other studies. 15. In line no 313, the antioxidant content of supplemented snacks (Table 4), correct this with table no 5 instead of table no 4. 16. In line no 323, The *In vitro* nutrient digestibility has been presented in Table 5. Correct this line with table 6 instead of table 5. 17. Conclusion is not well written, kindly add some findings and conclude your study on the basis of those findings. 18. In line no 372 remove comma after Sci, 19. In line no 389,392,394,399,401 and 437 kindly use abbreviation of journal name. 20. In line no 429 I think it would be Food Chem instead of Fd Chem kindly check and correct. **"After reviewing the manuscript, in my opinion that once the corrections will amended by the author than it will be fit and accepted for publication in your esteemed journal".**	

Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Pardeep Kumar Sadh***
Department, University & Country	***Department of Biotechnology, Chaudhary Devi Lal University, India***