



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_36899
Title of the Manuscript:	SENSORY EVALUATION ASSESSMENT OF BREAD PRODUCED WITH COMPOSITE FLOUR FERMENTED BY BAKER'S YEAST
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Line 107: The Cassava flour (B) and Wheat flour (C) are labelled differently here than elsewhere in the document. Lines 108-113; This information would be easier to read if incorporated into a Table; could include all the ingredients in the breads. Figures 3 & 4; Coming from a nutrition standpoint, having the numbers of each nutrient in a Table would be more significant (per 100 g). I could then look and see if they will actually meet the needs of the consumers comparing to Daily Values. A brief description in the Methods section to explain how you calculated the overall acceptability index (line 188) and evaluation index (line 171) would be appropriate since you do not reference a source for these methods.	Line 107 has been properly corrected to give a uniform description of the flours B and C. Thanks Line 108-113 are now represented in a table We represented the nutritional proximate compositions with figures to give a comparative view and relativity of the abundance of the nutrients in each flours. A sample reference of the method adopted for calculating the overall acceptability index of the product acceptability has now been in line 171 at $p \leq 0.05$ level of significance. Thanks
Minor REVISION comments	Line 90: protocols described in [5, 14]; double check alignment. Should it be 15?	Line 90 has now been corrected thanks.
Optional/General comments	Interesting combination of flours. Would be interesting to get a larger sample size for sensory to see if worthy for production.	We wanted to access the sensory appeal of the bread on a moderate scale level before we widen our scope in subsequent further evaluations. Thanks