

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_125658
Title of the Manuscript:	Chemical Composition and Storage Study of Debittered Orange-Seed Flour
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Sweet oranges are one of the major species in citrus family and its storage is one of the solution to post harvest losses. The study focus on the chemical composition and storage of sweet orange into debittered seed flour an innovative technique. The manuscript is appropriate.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes suitable	Thanks
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	No additions abstract is perfect to the manuscript	OK
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	All the material and methods are very well explained and little grammatical corrections are there in the manuscript. Result and discussion is up to the mark quoting the formulas wherever required.	Effectd
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Please try to add some more references	Added
Minor REVISION comments		Thanks
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is very well written and innovative research conducted is applaudable	

PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	