

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJFRN_126075 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | PHYSICO-CHEMICAL AND SENSORY ATTRIBUTES OF BREAD PRODUCED FROM WHEAT, CABBAGE AND CATERPILLAR INSECT FLOURS |
| Type of the Article | Research Article |

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

| Compulsory REVISION comments | Reviewer's comment | Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
|---|--|--|
| Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | I wholeheartedly support the significance of this research, especially for individuals residing in Asian countries. I appreciate the focus on improving the nutritional content, functional properties, and sensory evaluation of bread composite enriched with caterpillar insect flour and cabbage. It is worth noting that this product may not be well-received in countries like Ethiopia where insect flour foods are not commonly consumed. | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | The title of the manuscript is accurately depicted. | |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | The abstract, while well-written, lacks practical outcomes of the research work. It would be beneficial to discuss the fold increase in insect flour observed and its impact on other parameters. Additionally, explore any correlation between physicochemical values and sensory aspects. Simplify the abstract by explaining the significance of the numerical values and their implications for community health. | |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? | It is good, but the subheading "statistical data analysis" with experimental design should be included in the materials and methods section. | |
| Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | Although the quality of the work is praiseworthy, the bread composite product does not possess the necessary scientific credibility to be widely accepted in the market. Furthermore, I believe that the use of caterpillar insect flour is not commonly accepted in the Ethiopian context, which may cast doubt on the overall acceptability of the bread composite supplemented with caterpillar insect flour. | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | Most of the references are recent. I recommend ensuring consistency in referencing by including DOIs in all references in the same format. | |

Review Form 3

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| Minor REVISION comments | | |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language is well explained and suitable for scholarly communication. | |
| Optional/General comments | <p>The introduction effectively highlights the importance of bread, but consider adding a clear paragraph on the bread preparation process. Clearly outline the limitations of previous studies in the introduction to justify the current research. Ensure consistency in formatting by italicizing "et al." in all instances throughout the manuscript.</p> <p>Reviewer Comments</p> <p>The author's focus on enhancing the quality of bread in order to improve community acceptance of the product is commendable. The manuscript is well-written and effectively compares previous studies. However, there are some areas that need improvement before acceptance:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The abstract, while well-written, lacks practical outcomes of the research work. It would be beneficial to discuss the fold increase in insect flour observed and its impact on other parameters. Additionally, explore any correlation between physicochemical values and sensory aspects. Simplify the abstract by explaining the significance of the numerical values and their implications for community health.2. Arrange the keywords alphabetically under the abstract.3. The introduction effectively highlights the importance of bread, but consider adding a clear paragraph on the bread preparation process.4. Clearly outline the limitations of previous studies in the introduction to justify the current research.5. Ensure consistency in formatting by italicizing "et al." in all instances throughout the manuscript.6. Enhance the description of materials and methods, including sample preparation and bread-making processes.7. The subheading statistical data analysis and experimental design should be closed under material and methods section.8. Provide detailed explanations of the procedures for proximate analysis of the bread, including the formulas for determining moisture, ash, protein, fat, fiber, and total carbohydrates.9. Clearly explain the procedures for determining functional properties such as water absorption capacity, bulk density, and swelling index of the bread in the methods section.10. Provide a thorough explanation of the procedures for measuring physical properties such as loaf volume, specific volume, loaf height, and loaf weight in the methods section.11. Include the number of participants, age group, and ethical approval details in the sensory evaluation section.12. In the conclusion, focus on the main findings of the study and avoid including mean results.13. Ensure consistency in referencing by including DOIs in all references in the same format. | |

PART 2:

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | 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) |
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | (If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name: | Nesru Zeynu Seid |
| Department, University & Country | Holeta Agricultural Research Center, Ethiopia |