SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
1. The level of fortification for coating method is very high (for example 90g/kg zinc which is equivalent to almost 11% of total product). As per my knowledge, this much level is not permissible. Do the authors followed any legal standards and considered the upper safe limit of micronutrients for fortification? 2. Proximate composition of the acha grains is not mentioned anywhere. 3. In results for vitamin A analysis, it would have been better if HPLC chromatogram is provided rather than low resolution acha grain photographs and retention time and peak area details. 4. Discussion part is very poorly written. 5. No information about the model and specifications of HPLC and AAS system used in the study have been provided. 6. Why zinc content in dusted acha is higher while in case of iron, copper and vitamin A this method is comparably not that much effective. 7. If the data has been subjected to statistical analysis then why super scripts for level of significance are not there in any data provided in results section. 8. Language and grammar needs improvement and the manuscript is not well structured too.	**1. The level of iron, copper and zinc are in mg/kg, it has been corrected appropriately.** **2. Proximate composition is not part of the research.** **3. Chromatograms for both the coating and dusting technologies have been attached in the manuscript.** **4. The discussion section has been modified.** **5. The model and specifications for both HPLC and AAS have been indicated in the work.** **6. It was explained in the discussion section.** **7. For vitamin A, the final result is an average of duplicate analysis. While for mineral elements, one-way ANOVA was performed and a post hoc test was also performed for significant difference.** **8. Done appropriately.**