



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_6610
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of orange peel flour on the quality of bread
Type of the Article	Research Paper

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. The quality of manuscript preparation is fairish, and there are some mistakes need to be improved : - Line 28 ...(Ihekoronye and Ngoddy, 1965) , there is no this article cited in the "Reference" section. - Line 48 2. MATERIALS AND MATERIALS may be METHODS - Line 88 ...acceptability of the cookies by..... But the product of this work is bread, isn't it? - Line 101 ...between 24.25 and 27.25%..., but the value in the Table1 is 24.45%. - Line 115 ...between 267.0 and 287.85 kcal/ 100g..., but the value in the Table1 is 287.52. - Line 142 ...(Akobundu et al. (1988)). But in the Reference on Line 194 the year is 1998. Please check which is correct? - Table 3 Specific volume (cm/g) please correct the unit of volume to cm³. - Line 218-219 why this article uses Capital letter on each word , which is different from the others. Please make it consistently. 2. Overall, the language used in the paper is easy to understand; however, it is not concise in some part. To meet better quality, the manuscript should be sought for the assistance of an English native speaker for editing.	Ihekoronye and Ngoddy, 1985 has been included in the reference section. Corrected Corrected to read <u>bread samples</u> Corrected ; the Table has been corrected to be 24.25% The table has been corrected to read 287.85 Corrected to 1998 Corrected Corrected



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Please specify the time of sundried for orange peel flour (OPF) preparation. 2. Why increasing OPF causes a reduction of moisture content? Please discuss about the relationship between decreasing moisture content and increasing fibre. 3. For sensory evaluation, the author should additionally discuss the impact of OPF on taste, crust and crumb colour and other attributes; for example, it causes darker colour, compact texture and unpleasant taste.	Done. Done. Done
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Overall, the objective and introduction are clear and methods are well described. The author provided the statement of purpose relevant to the research area studied. The appropriate standard procedures for analysis were used. The finding is of interest to add new information to the literature.	