



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 (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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The comments raised were indicated in the main text. Authors need to give detailed discussion of the results obtained. Standard deviation of parameters evaluated should be provided. Also, conclusion section is weak. This should include key findings from the study and recommendations in terms of the best blend among bread samples evaluated.	1. The word quality is not restricted to nutritional studies. If the title had said nutritional quality, then the comment would be apt. The quality in this study included sensory quality, physical quality etc. 2. I do not think that the use of mean values with superscripts indicating where significant differences exist without showing the standard deviation (as done in this work) is wrong and so it was left in its form. 3. The conclusion, as well as some other sections was rewritten to answer some of the concerns of the reviewer.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		