

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_129291
Title of the Manuscript:	Food additives and processing aids used in bread-making
Type of the Article	Review 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

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	As bread is a food that provides a large part of the nutrient requirements of consumers, being one of the most consumed foods in the world, its study is a welcome one for both bread producers and the scientific field. Accumulating existing information in the literature on the study of ingredients and supplements used in the production of bread is important for both bakers and the international academic world given the nutritional value of this staple food, which makes it so widely consumed worldwide. Including the use of ingredients that are more or less controversial for human health is welcome. Due to the above, I consider this bibliographic study to be a welcome one.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the review article is suitable.	
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.	The abstract of the article is well done.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, I think the manuscript is scientifically correct and the structure and subsection of the manuscript are appropriate for a review article.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references is sufficient for an review article (64 references) and relatively recently (54 of them is after year 2010), I think it is very good.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes. The language quality are suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments	I have made a corrections in the full article with the red colour. The review article can be published after a minor revision.	

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:	Mihai- Iacob Bentea
Department, University & Country	University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine from Cluj-Napoca (USAMVCN), Romania