

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
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	

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

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (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.	1)The unit for the formulation of the composite noodles are confusing and should be corrected. Total % of each composite should not be more than 100% during compounding. If this is wrong, then the results will be wrongly presented. 2)Each composite should have been well labelled during compounding.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No. The enrichment was not just for fibre, but also meant to enrich the protein content	
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.	See comments on the manuscript	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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.	1)The unit for the formulation of the composite noodles are confusing and should be corrected. Total % of each composite should not be more than 100% during compounding. If this is wrong, then the results will be wrongly presented. 2)Each composite should have been well labelled during compounding.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	There is inconsistency in the author/s citation methods in the body of the manuscript	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, with minor corrections	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 3

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:	Joan O. Ogundele
Department, University & Country	Federal University Oye Ekiti, Nigeria