

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_96447
Title of the Manuscript:	QUALITY AND ANTIOXIDANT ACTIVITY TEST OF PURPLE SWEET POTATO (<i>Ipomoea batatas</i> . L) FLOUR WITH SUBSTITUTION OF WHEAT FLOUR
Type of the Article	

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:

(<https://www.journaljaeri.com/index.php/JAERI/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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 manuscript presents a topical study, with practical applications, about the effect of substitution of wheat flour with purple sweet potato flour on the properties of the resulting sponge roll cakes. The authors described the purpose of the research and the materials and methods used. The obtained results demonstrate that the substitution of wheat flour with purple sweet potato flour improved the physico-chemical and sensory characteristics of sponge roll cakes.</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3.Yes</p> <p>4.Yes</p> <p>5, 6</p> <p>- The English language must be corrected throughout the text. For example: pg. 2 in RESEARCH METHODS, section Materials and tools, the entire text; table 1, etc.</p> <p>- The writing of the scientific nomenclature of plants must be checked and corrected to be in italic fonts.</p> <p>- what does the abbreviation TBM represent? (TBM = emulsifier?)</p> <p>- the writing of the indices in the formula of chemical substances must be corrected</p> <p>- Pg 3, 4, 5,6,7,8 - Double presentation of data (both in tables and in graphs) must be avoided.</p> <p>-Page 4 – "According to Ambarsari et al (2009), purple sweet potato flour has a water content of 83.3%," -this moisture is for purple sweet potato, not for purple sweet potato flour</p> <p>- For all histograms – the units of measure must be written (eg % or others)</p> <p>-Pg 5 - "The ash content of wheat flour is 0.46% while the ash content of sweet potato flour is 1.91 (Mukhlisa et al 2013)." -1.91 %</p> <p>-Pg 7 - the crude fiber content of the rolled sponge cake is rather high, (between 7 and 19%) if "The crude fiber content of purple sweet potato flour is 2.40% (Nindyarani, et al 2011) while that of wheat flour is 1.92%". – these values should be checked.</p> <p>-Pg 8 – it is not clear how the antioxidant activity was calculated (which was the reference standard against which it was calculated, e.g. Trolox, ascorbic acid or others).</p> <p>-Pg 10 - "had no significant effect on antioxidant activity" - it seems that it still has a quite significant influence, because the antioxidant activity increased from 40% to 62%.</p> <p>- the References section must be checked and corrected</p> <p>In conclusion, the entire text should be checked and corrected, because there are a large number of mistakes.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>should be corrected in some sentences</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mariana Ferdes
Department, University & Country	University Politehnica of Bucharest, Romania