

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">European Journal of Nutrition &amp; Food Safety</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_123838
Title of the Manuscript:	Development and Quality Evaluation of Fibre Enriched Broken Basmati Rice Based Noodles
Type of the Article	Research Article

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

## Review Form 3

### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The enriched noodles provides functional features (fibre and other nutrients). I believe that such research studies, which support sustainable nutrition, are necessary at a time when it is becoming increasingly difficult to meet nutritional needs. In addition, some technological advantages have also been found (such as reduced cooking time and cooking loss).	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	"Development and Quality Evaluation of Fibre Enriched Noodles Based on Broken Basmati Rice" or "Development and Quality Evaluation of Fibre Enriched Broken Basmati Rice Noodles" is recommended.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Abstract section is scientifically sufficient. If possible, the abstract section of the study should summarise the results of the study and highlight any striking findings with figures. In the first sentence of abstract; 'equal nutrition' is recommended to replace with 'same nutritional value' In the last sentence of abstract; 'content' should be replaced with 'contents'	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Although the topic is original, the article contains some omissions in experimental methods and/or method descriptions. In the 'Preparation of green leaf powder' section, the determination of the boiling temperature and time should be explained and, if possible, a reference to a literature study should be provided. '50:50:: fenugreek:coriander green leaf powder.' should be corrected to '50:50: fenugreek:coriander green leaf powder.' There is difficulty in reading the text in Figure 1, I think this problem can be solved by increasing the height of each individual figure and centring the text in the figure. In the 'storage' section the brand of the polyethylene pouches should be indicated in brackets. When temperatures are reported in the study, the degree symbol (°) is expressed with different symbols in different sections. This usage should be harmonised within the study. It is recommended to change 'c.f.u/g' to 'CFU/g'. Table 1 should be self-explanatory. Therefore, the meaning of BBRF, GLP and GM should be written below the table or in the title.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References section is scientifically sufficient.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The text is recommended to check for grammar.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	-	

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 2:**

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

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Hande Ozge Guler Dal</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Burdur Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, Turkiye</b>