

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_110541
Title of the Manuscript:	QUALITY CHARACTERISTICS AND SENSORY PROPERTIES OF BREAD ELABORATED WITH FLOUR BLENDS OF WHEAT AND AFRICAN YAM BEAN
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Comment [A1]: Elaborated

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The topic is the timing issue in looking for alternative food sources. However, the improved quality parameters are not appreciable.</p> <p>2. Ok</p> <p>3. Ok</p> <p>4. Ok, but remove full stop (2.1.1 and 3.1). Furthermore, the quality of fig., 1 & 2 Very poor. Revisit again.</p> <p>5. Ok</p> <p>6. Try to replace any extremely out-dated references with fresh ones if at all possible. Nonetheless, the sources listed below are located inside the manuscript's body but are not included in the references section:</p> <p>Akapata and Akubor (1999)</p> <p>Onimawo and Akubor (2012)</p> <p>Yusuf et al (2013)</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Ok	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In page 16</p> <p>The results of overall acceptability scores of the samples are shown in Table 5. The overall acceptability scores ranged from 3.85 to 7.05. Samples A and E were rated moderately desirable and moderately undesirable, respectively.</p> <p>Revise this part again b/c, there is no sample E.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">The proximate composition of each flour must be included in the manuscript (if possible)The author provide more explanation on some exceptional case like why sample B has exceptional has high carbohydrate content. <p>3.2.2 Change in bulk density of the flour samples, in the manuscript the bulk density ranges from 0.28 to 0.3g/ml. But in Table 4, ranges from 0.3 to 0.37g/ml. pls check this part again.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Bizuneh Adinew
Department, University & Country	Mizan-Tepi University, Ethiopia