The work is focused on the study of the nutritional and antioxidant potential of Maya nut flour in order to be used on food enrichment. To this purpose, the drying process of the flour by using a natural sun drying and different drying temperatures have been evaluated. The elemental and chemical composition, the colour, the water and oil absorption capacities, among other properties, were analysed. Finally, two of the analysed flours were used in different proportions to be incorporated into the cookie formulation and the nutritional profile and the antioxidant activity were compared. It is an interesting work in the functional food field that could be helpful to expand knowledge so I recommend it to be published, but it should be deeply reviewed as, frequently, the connection between the text and the results showed is lost and, also, there are several format errors. Hence, the following major revisions should be made:

Introduction:

The introduction is generally well described, but information about the availability and uses of enriched cookies in the market as functional foods is missed.

Materials and Methods:

- Line 70-71: Specify how long the seeds were sun-dried and the store temperature.
- Line 72: Specify the concentration of the sodium hypochlorite solution.
- Check the equations: format of number in equations must be uniform. Also check the numbering, equation (3) is repeated.
- Line 77: Remove the subsection if there is just one.
- Line 119: Define the time used for mixing the suspensions.
- Line 132: Check the spell of "tree".
- Line 145: "In" is repeated twice, check.
- Line 159: Check the reference 2.10.1., should be 2.11.1.
- Line 175 and 181: adjust properly the numeral for the absorbance value and its error.
- Line 191: It is said that NF was used for the enrichment of the cookies, but in the results and discussion section, it is also showed the results obtained from the CF sample. Please include it here also.

Results and Discussion:

- Check the number of the tables, table 2 is repeated. Check and correct also the references in the text.
- Line 214: In table 2, define the units for "Mean diameter".
- Line 218: Why these conditions make the sample interesting for obtaining beneficial products? It is said that they could be an interesting alternative to this purpose, but, alternative to what?
- Line 223: In table 2 make the units uniform for all the components to percentage. Correct also in the text. How was de energy value determined? Please include it in the materials and methods section.
- Line 229: Translate "para" to English.
- Line 249-251: A little review about the total and essential amino acids in Maya nut flour is missed here, in comparison with those presented in corn and wheat cereals.
- Line 255-257: Make clearer that these results are from NF samples.
- Line 259-260: The differences found in the mineral content in comparison with the author Subiría et al. due to the analytical procedure should be more clearly described. Give the reasons.
- Line 264-265: Explain how water and Aw affect to food safety.
- Line 275: Use the same code to refer to WAC and OAC. Use these or OHC and WHC, but not exchange. The same in the materials and methods section.

- Line 276: Correct “&” spelled.
- Line 282: The statistical analysis for water activity (Aw) is missed. Please review and place the proper number of numerals in the average and the error for the determined parameters.
- Line 290-292: It is said that flours obtained from unroasted seeds, that is NF, are lighter and lower red and yellow, but in Table 4, the parameters indicate the opposite: lower value for L*, and higher values of a* and b* of NF in comparison with the F45 and F60 flours.
- Line 294 and 296: Review the values “13.40” and “17.70”, it is not the same than specified in the table below. In line 296, specify what values are for a* and b* parameters.
- Line 299-304: If during Maillard reactions compounds with high antioxidant activity are generated, why is better to use moderate temperatures under which they are not produced? Why the browning of the flours after these reactions could affect its quality?
- Line 348: Translate “y” to English.
- Line 358-387: The occurrence of Maillard reactions is said as a possible cause of the increase in the antioxidant activity of the CF samples. However, in the F60 sample, also produced after a roasting process, the TPC and the antioxidant activity determined by the three different methods, DPPH, ABTS, FRAP, are the lowest in comparison with the other samples. Please give a possible reason.
- Line 389: Explain why so big differences were found between ABTS and the rest of the analysis for antioxidant activity and also explain why with ABTS differences among samples were not identified but they were with the other assays.
- Line 422-425: The sentence seems to be not complete, review.
- Check the number of the figures: figure 5 is missed. Check also the references in the text.
- Line 429-431: Rephrase for a better understanding.
- Line 436: Please include the statistical analysis in the comparison of NF and CF nutritional components (figure 6). Also, re-scale the total carbohydrates figure to fit properly the error bars.
- Line 438-442: Rephrase. It is not all correct: for NF the protein content increased by increasing the maya nut flour proportion but up to 40%, it remains stable if still increases up to 60%. For CF protein content does not decrease with increasing concentration in all conditions: it increases from 0% to 20% and then, it starts to decrease if maya nut flour increases more. Also, find a reference to support the statement given about protein being affected by the thermal procedure.
- Line 448-451: Review. It is not correct. For NF sample, the fat proportion seems to be the same for 0 and 20% samples, and similar for 40 and 60%, support with the statistical analysis. Although it was significant different, the samples are very similar in the fat content, between 14 and 16 %.
- Line 462: Check the numbering, subsection 2.9 is repeated.
- Line 467: Add the statistical analysis in the figure.
- Line 470-473: Review, the statement does not agree with the results showed in the graph.
- Line 429: delete the last reference style.

Conclusions: Some of the most important results obtained in the work should be stated here to support the conclusions reached.