

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_130656
Title of the Manuscript:	Unlocking the Potential of Chia Seed: A Comprehensive Review of its Potential Applications
Type of the Article	

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This topic demonstrated the potential applications of chia seeds. It will be share to improve human health trough consumption and additionally will be allow for exploiting of future researches.	We really appreciate the reviewer's feedback
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	We really appreciate the reviewer's feedback
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.	Although it is well written, I suggest that the same sentence “Chia, originally from Mexico and Guatemala, is now cultivated globally, including in Australia, Europe, and America” had been written in the introduction. Rewrite this for making the difference in these sections. In the introduction, authors regarding the previous studies indicated three varieties of chia. It is important to mention the growth cycle for each varieties. Why don’t you limited to oil and protein content? Complete with oil index (iodine value, saponification value, acid value, peroxide value and ester value) the biochemical traits cited (oil and protein). Corrected the written of scientific name (utilized the italic). Comparatively to hexane extraction, alternatively water or other solvent can be used. Make the difference between them for prioritizing the better solvent. Precise the protein content, antioxidants level dietary fiber after oil extraction comparatively to the amounts before oil extraction.	Changes have been made as per reviewer’s suggestions
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Overall, the manuscript is scientifically good but some incoherence’s were noted namely the scientific names, sounds of a few words (mucilage, emulsion) needing the corrections on one hand and the other hand more comprehension.	Changes have been made as per reviewer’s suggestions
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes but authors could be referred to suggestions.	Changes have been made as per reviewer’s suggestions
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes. It is affordable	We really appreciate the reviewer's feedback
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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