

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_108294
Title of the Manuscript:	Essential Amino Acid composition of Noodles Analogue from Aerial Yam, Rice, and African Yam Bean flour blend using Response Surface Methodology
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, because the noodles formulated here improve their essential amino acid composition In addition, RSM contributes to optimizing the extrusion process to obtain the analogue noodles. But questions related to the easiness of producing these analogues in Nigeria and if they taste as good as a genuine noodle have no answer. Perhaps the authors could state them as future work</p> <p>Yes, it reflects the content of the article</p> <p>Not really, the abstract needs an improvement</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>In my opinion few references are cited</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No, English need to be revised. Although I am not a native English, some sentences need to be rewritten. Sometimes is not easy to understand the content, especially in the Introduction.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>No, English needs to be revised. Although I am not a native English, some sentences need to be rewritten. Sometimes is not easy to understand the content.</p> <p>Abstract: the extruder does not need to be detailed in the abstract. One of the levels is "a" or "alpha"? In Subsection 2.4 "alpha" is typed instead "a". The fragment "content ranged from" is unnecessarily repeated for each amino acid.</p> <p>Introduction: this part is disorganized, the objective is stated at the end of the first paragraph and at the end of this section, please, try to refund it in one paragraph. The ideas in the first paragraph are not well commented on and not well connected. I missed a sentence/paragraph related to noodles consumption/popularity in Nigeria. The reason to choose these 3 products (rice, aerial yam, and yam bean flour) to elaborate noodles analogue is their nutritional complementarity, but this fact is not clearly reported in the introduction. The second paragraph can be inserted in the middle of the first paragraph. Third paragraph: something related to blending protein sources with foods containing hydrocarbons to form analogues foods as noodles could be an alternative to increase protein ingestion. Part of this 4th paragraph is also written in the next one; please, refund them.</p> <p>Materials and methods: subsection 2.3, why were the reasons to choose those percentages? The last word in Subsection 2.7 has no meaning there: exterminators?</p> <p>Results and Discussion: The reference related to FAO/WHO (1985), is the more recent recommendation for amino acids` daily requirements.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>Conclusions: The authors should comment what is the ideal combination of the 3 variables for the extrusion, regarding the obtention of the best amino acid composition</p> <p>Table 1: units for amino acids are not included Table 2: some columns have words separated in two rows, please arrange those columns` width.</p> <p>Figures: for RSM figures with 3 axes should be recommendable instead 2 dimensional graphics in order to have a better interpretation of the results.</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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Concepción Pérez-Lamela
Department, University & Country	University of Vigo, Spain