

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_98997
Title of the Manuscript:	QUALITY CHARACTERISTICS OF BREAKFAST CEREALS PRODUCED FROM MILLET FLOUR SUPPLEMENTED WITH SOYBEAN AND DATE FRUIT FLOURS.
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.journalacri.com/index.php/ACRI/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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, the study is significant in terms of food development for attainment of good nutrition and health.</p> <p>Quality Characteristics seem too general/vague maybe best to indicate the quality in terms of Nutritional Content, Sensory Characteristics and Acceptability of.....</p> <p>Yes, however it is best to incorporate the values of the sensory evaluation and the acceptability test rating/score instead of stating it as high</p> <p>Yes, however there is a need to provide more discussions to explain the gathered data</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>-----additional comments and suggestions-----</p> <p>What was the basis for the substitution amount of 5 to 20% for date fruit and 5 to 30% for soybean? Is there a previous study that indicates the acceptability of the ratio used in the study? Why not use higher amounts if objective is to enrich the breakfast cereal?</p> <p>Maybe best to add more descriptors to the raw materials e.g variety and or maturity, size or color perhaps, inserting images of the raw materials will also be beneficial to the study</p> <p>In what form was the breakfast cereal chemically analyzed? Was it the raw dry form? Not the ready to eat form? I think it is important to state this in the methodology.</p> <p>Why use DMRT? And not Tukey's?</p> <p>Table 1 for the parameters indicate as "dry weight" e.g Total Ash (g ash/100g dry weight)</p> <p>"The moisture content ranged from 7.19 to 7.63% with the control sample (Breakfast cereal made with 100% malted millet flour) having the least moisture content (7.19%), while the sample substituted with 30% soybean and 20% date fruit flours had the highest value (7.63%). Why is the moisture content of supplemented cereals higher than the control? What was the effect of substituting soybean and date fruit flours?</p> <p>There was significant (p<0.05) difference in moisture content between the samples. The low moisture content obtained in this study is in agreement with the report of Mbaeyi-Nwaoha and Uchendu (2016) for breakfast cereals made from blends of acha and fermented soybean paste (okara)".</p> <p>"The protein content of the samples which ranged from 7.69 to 18.32% was observed to increase with increased substitution of soybean and date fruit flours in the products". Comparing the soybean and date fruit substitutes, which one resulted to higher protein content? What also is the reason?</p> <p>Same as with fat and other nutrients, there is a need to expound the values of the different formulation. Additional explanation why fat content increased with supplementation given the variation.</p> <p>"The iron content of the breakfast cereal products produced in this study was lower than the recommended US RDA of 10-15mg/100g." again why? How much was the improvement of supplemented cereals, which one exhibited the most increase in nutrient, was it the soybean or the date fruit? State the reason as well.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>“reported by Mbaeyi-Nwaoha and Uchendu (2016) for breakfast cereals produced from blends of acha and fermented soybean paste (okara)”, are there other references to compare the observed data?.</p> <p>Based on the sensory evaluation, the formulation with least amounts of soybean and date fruit was the most acceptable (at around 7), what are your recommendations to make it more acceptable and what was in general the physical effects of the substituted materials in the sensory characteristics that contributed to its low acceptability? There is a need to provide more discussion on this part too.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There is a need to review the manuscript by a language editor.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The study is of significance. However, the results need to be explained more and some parts of the paper may still be further improved. Recommendation to further make the product most acceptable is also need to be stated in the manuscript.</p>	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Aimee Sheree A. Barrion
Department, University & Country	Institute of Human Nutrition and Food, University of the Philippines Los Baños, Philippines