

### **Editorial Comments:**

I have gone through all the stages for evaluating the manuscript under review and my comments are as follows:

1. Both reviewers have made scientifically sound comments on the manuscript and I do agree with their comments.
2. The authors have complied with the instructions of the reviewers, and have improved the manuscript content wise.
3. None of the reviewers rejected the manuscript after the final corrections were done by the authors of the manuscript.

However, I feel that the manuscript is still need corrections and lots of grammatical mistakes & sentencing errors are there and some technical issues are still there which needs attention

### **My few queries to the author in this regard are**

- (1) Water activity itself is a good parameter to judge the quality and to predict the shelf life of the powdered product. Why water activity was not measured.
- (2) Other physicochemical properties of the powdered products are also missing.

Some grammatical mistakes have been reviewed by me and mentioned in the attached manuscript but there are lots of sentences which need to be revised before publishing it to the final version.

Therefore, I hereby recommend that the manuscript “**Evaluation of the nutritional status and acceptability of powdered reconstituted Kunu-zaki; an index of increasing shelf life**” be accepted for publication in “Asian Food Science Journal” after proper English editing and answering the queries mentioned above.

### **Author's Comment:**

I have gone through the reviewers comments both on the manuscript and editorial decision.

All the mistakes pointed out by the reviewer have been corrected.

Also, all grammatical mistakes have been looked into and duly corrected and sentencing errors are recast. Thank you very much.

The water activity of the powdered product was below 2% before it was reconstituted for proximate and sensory evaluation. It wasn't included in the result previously but has been included now both in the result and discussion.