

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">European Journal of Nutrition &amp; Food Safety</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_127886
Title of the Manuscript:	Quality characteristics of bread produced with blends of flour from cassava, wheat and Bambara groundnut ( <i>Vigna subterranea</i> )
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: Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	<b>The manuscript will provide more knowledge and increase data in the research focus.</b>	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<b>The title is suitable.</b>	
<b>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.</b>	<b>The abstract is not comprehensive. The abstract written did not do justice to the manuscript. In this order the abstract should be briefly written; Introduction, objective, materials and methods, results and conclusion.</b>	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	The manuscript is scientifically correct.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	Some of the references are recent and some are old. In general it can be improved on.	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	On an average, the language of the article is suitable for scholarly communication.	
<b><u>Optional/General</u> comments</b>	<b>In general, the manuscript can be worked on. Also, the writer should reduce the numbers of pages. 32 pages for an article is too much. Maximum should be 15 pages.</b>	

#### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>Omolara Racheal Adegbanke</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Federal University of Technology, Akure (FUTA), Nigeria</b>