



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
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 <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>
--	---------------------------	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

Compulsory REVISION comments	There are some comments in :- -<u>Line 8</u> : phytochemical has been changed to phytochemicals. -<u>Line 10</u>: phytochemical contents has been changed to phytochemicals content. -<u>Line 12</u>: (P=.05) has been changed to ((P>.05) in all manuscript. -<u>Line 16</u>: added one keyword (Quality). -<u>Line 19</u>: (Citrus sinensis) has been written in Italic font. -<u>Line 28</u>: (Ihekoronye and Ngoddy, 1985) hasn't been found in reference. -<u>Line 50</u>: (Citrus sinensis) has been written in Italic font. -<u>Line 61</u>: fermented for 90 min has been changed to fermented for 90 min at (.....Temperature and Humidity) and proofing for 2h at (..... Temperature). -<u>Line 63</u>: changed AOAC(1990) by the newest edition. -<u>Line 83</u>: added reference for oven spring determination -<u>Line 93</u>: added reference for sensory evaluation. -<u>Line 101</u>: 24.25 has been changed to 24.45 -<u>Line 115</u>: 287.85 has been changed to 287.52 -<u>Line 126</u>: In title of table (1) breads has been changed to bread samples and in table (1) the sum of line 4 must be 100 not 100.2 -<u>Line 130</u>: phytochemicals in bread has been changed to Some phytochemicals content in bread samples. -<u>Line 132</u>: least has been changed to lowest. -<u>Line 136</u>: phytochemicals in bread has been changed to Some phytochemicals content in bread samples. -<u>Line 142</u>: 1988 has been changed to 1998. -<u>Line 148</u>: In title of table (3) breads has been changed to bread samples <u>Line 157</u>: In title of table (4) breads has been changed to bread samples <u>Line 202</u>: assessed has been changed to accessed <u>Line 228</u>: (Treobroma grandiflorum) has been written in	Done Done The journal instruction in the SDI template advises authors to use P=0.05 instead of P>0.05 Done Done Corrected Done Corrected Corrected Done Corrected Corrected Corrected Corrected Corrected Corrected Corrected Corrected Corrected Done Done Done
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Italic font	
--	-------------	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	-Line 42: aimed of the manuscript hasn't been explained the substitution levels of orange peel flour with wheat flour	Corrected
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	-Line 2: Title of the manuscript (Effect of orange peel flour on the quality of bread) has been changed to Effect of Orange Peel Flour on the Quality Characteristics of Bread . - Pleas that enough one reference from www.com	Changed