

-----Original Message-----

From: XXX YYY<xxx@yyy.zzz>

Sent: Sun, Oct 20, 2013 at 7:53 PM

To: Managing Editor

Subject: Re: Request for final decision for manuscript number 2013/BJAST/6610

Ref: Referees comments on: 'Effect of orange peel flour on the quality of bread' by Okpala and Akpu.

Referring to your last e-mail please find my comments about the manuscript.

The authors considered generally the referees remarks, resulting in acceptance of the manuscript for publication by all 4 referees. However, there are still some doubts; for instance the authors note in the text (L.12, L.96, L.106, L.108) that significant differences at $p=0.05$ are observed. It seems that instead of " $p=0.05$ " it should be " $p<0.05$ ". This statement is in contrast with the authors' response to one of the referees' criticism. After all a referee writes that "-Line 12: ($P=.05$) has been changed to ($P>.05$) in all manuscript" whilst the authors respond that; the journal instruction in the SDI template advises authors to use $P=0.05$ instead of $P>0.05$; It is nonsense.

Moreover, it would be worth mentioning about proficiency test or quality assurance/control of the analytical methods/techniques used (accuracy, precision).

As for the conclusion section, the authors mention that The use of OPF in bread ...reduce environmental pollution. They should explain on which way such reduction is possible!

Therefore the manuscript should be carefully and thoroughly checked with respect to the above mentioned specific questions as well as to others, e.g. to its editorial quality.

Editor's Details:

Szefer Piotr

Department of Food Sciences, Medical University of Gdansk, Poland

Note: Modification was done in this document ONLY to hide the email id