

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFRN_105534
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of Addition of Naked Barley and Broken Rice on Chemical, Rheological and Organoleptic Properties of Balady Bread
Type of the Article	Original Research 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://journalajfrn.com/index.php/AJFRN/editorial-policy>

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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is important for the scientific community, especially for its contribution to flour blending to obtain composite flours rich in nutrients and minerals to alleviate malnutrition problems in less developed countries. 2. Suggested title: Influence of the incorporation of naked barley and broken rice flours in the production of Balady bread. 3. The summary of the article was not too clear and concise. There were too many explanations. I proposed a summary directly in the manuscript. 4. The subtitles and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. 5. The manuscript is scientifically correct and even topical. 6. The references are still acceptable, despite two small corrections I've just made directly on the manuscript: the first and second references. <p>The authors chose to improve the nutritional quality of Balady bread by incorporating two different types of flour. They first analyzed the flours separately before mixing them, then mixed them in different proportions, and finally processed and analyzed the resulting bread.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	the quality of the language is acceptable, with a few minor problems	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

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:	Tamba Sompila Arnaud Wenceslas Geoffroy
Department, University & Country	National Institute for Research in Engineering Science, Innovation and Technology, Congo