

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_111713
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutrient-Rich Red Rice-Based Pasta: Formulation, Processing and Comprehensive Nutritional Analysis
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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?</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</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>1. The manuscript is very interesting regarding the use of vegetable raw materials, of starchy origin, in order to develop new food products with important functional and technological properties that may be accepted by the consumer. The manuscript requires some adaptations so that the reader can have a better understanding of the research proposal.</p> <p>2. I think the title could be adjusted. Title suggestion: Development of red rice-based pastas: physicochemical, technological and sensory properties and shelf life</p> <p>3. The abstract needs adjustments. My suggestions follow in the comments of the manuscript.</p> <p>4. The structure of the manuscript sections is adequate. However, I made some caveats: 1st. as for making the sections clearer (being numbered); 2nd. regarding the order in which the analysis methodologies could be written in the "Materials and Methods" section and, consequently, the order in which the Results and Discussions of each variable could be written.</p> <p>5. The manuscript needs some small adaptations to have a more appropriate scientific context. My suggestions are in the comments of the Word file.</p> <p>6. The references could be updated, as many of them are from more than 10 years ago. If possible, it's worth trying to update to references from the last 5 years.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>It would be interesting for the text to be revised in terms of language, in general. Mainly in relation to technical and scientific terms, and also some parts that are confusing.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The "Results and Discussion" section is extremely confusing, and the results were barely discussed. Many adaptations and doubts need to be resolved and clarified so that the manuscript has more solid scientific characteristics. My questions and suggestions can be found in the comments of the original manuscript. I recommend that the manuscript be published only if the suggested changes are made.</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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alline Emannuele Chaves Ribeiro
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Goiás, Brazil