

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Biochemistry International</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JOB1_12757</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Biochemical Characterization and Shelf-Life Studies of Twin-Screw Extruded Fish Snacks Using Mackerel and Rohu Powders</b>
Type of the Article	

**PART 1: Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>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.</b>	This manuscript explores extrusion to develop fish-based snacks that are both nutritious and shelf-stable. Use of konkan region-based fish powder along with corn and millet flours shows a unique combination to improve the protein and nutrient content of snacks. Underutilized fish resources can support local economies and improve food security. Overall, this research provides valuable insights into developing healthier extruded snacks and expanding the use of fish in it.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title is suitable as it clearly reflects the focus of the study. However, 'storage' word can be replaced.  Example: "Development and Shelf-Life Study of Twin-Screw Extruded Fish Snacks Using Mackerel and Rohu Powder."	

<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>Abstract is found suitable to give proper idea about the manuscript.</p>	
<p><b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b></p>	<p>The manuscript is found correct but it needs major improvement.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How <b>processing influences the results</b>.</li> <li>2. <b>Explain reason</b> properly for each result.</li> <li>3. Although title mentions <b>storage study</b> but it is not explained in manuscript.</li> <li>4. <b>Statistical analysis</b> of results should be done to find if there is significant difference or not.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>More references should be used to compare the result with <b>existing literature survey and judge</b> if there is any significant improvement or not.</p>	
<p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes, the language is found suitable for scholarly communication. But the quality of English seems to be <b>AI generated</b>. It needs to be rephrased.</p>	
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u> comments</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mention the <b>country name</b> of sourcing place along with state. If proper specification is there, mention that also.</li> <li>2. <b>Mismatch in moisture content</b>. In “Extrusion Parameters” it is mentioned 15% while in “Preparation of extrudates” it is 12%.</li> <li>3. What is this ‘<b>5</b>’ for in “Binding Agents: Tapioca starch (3–5%)<b>5</b>.”</li> <li>4. Write at least equation in methodology if any. Write at least few lines about the process.</li> </ol>	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Akash Kusum Maiti</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>National Institute of Technology, India</b>