



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Food Science Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_51647
Title of the Manuscript:	Quality evaluation of composite bread produced from wheat and fermented cashew kernel flours
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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

**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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p><b>Abstract</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>replace "proprieties" by "properties"</li> <li>Falling number and abbreviation "FN" is commonly used (not "HF"); name Hagberg use for the first time, but then reduce its count to a minimum</li> <li>replace "208.02 to 229.23 g, 433.43 to 657.02 cm<sup>3</sup> and 1.8 to 3.20 cm<sup>3</sup>/g" by "208 to 229 g, 433 to 657 cm<sup>3</sup> and 1.80 to 3.20 cm<sup>3</sup>/g" (your original version has not a physical sense)</li> </ol> <p><b>Keywords</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>add "Alveograph" or "Dough rheology" after "Composite flour"</li> </ol> <p><b>Introduction</b></p> <p>line 43: appoint the main nutrition components of cashew kernel + references</p> <p><b>Mats &amp; Mets</b></p> <p>line 55-58: add reference to used formula; why no fat/margarine was not used?  line 63: correct "° C" to "°C"  line 64: replace "by [11]" by "by Ijarotimi et al. [11]" (and similarly within the mspt body)  line 67: the same as for line 64  line 69: why not a producer and type of the hammer mill used is not mentioned?  line 73-75: revise the blends abbreviations according to the MINOR revision comments below, points d) and e)  (my recommendation is e.g. WF10FC for blend mixed from 90 wt. % of wheat flour and 10 % of fermented cashew kernel flour instead of illogical "FBAF10"; moreover, within table and footnotes, different abbreviations are used!  line 73: why the sign "(w/w)" is written <b>bold</b>?  line 74: set the blender type  line 77-78: move "[13]" to the end of the sentence; delete "(2010)"  line 79: insert a comma into "Chopin NG France"  line 84: delete "(Joules)"  line 91: wheat does mean words conjunction "during at"; appoint also relative humidity value into fermentation chamber  line 93: - unify font within "235 °C"; baking with or without steaming?  - why not other method as e.g. determination of crumb penetration was not applied? That method also could be combined with storage trial for a few days of manufactured bread (better evaluation of sensory acceptability).  line 95: correct French "volumetrique" to English "volumetric"  line 101: correct "Ashes" to "Ash"  line 102: see comment to line 64 – use "method of AOAC [18]"; why "Cookie samples" (instead of bread samples)?  line 103: see comment to line 64 – use "described in paper [19]"  line 111: correct to "as described by Meilgaard et al [20]"  line 114: correct to "Statistica 7.1 software"; "Neuman-Keuls"  line 115: Do not start sentence with any sign; correct to: "...the samples. Likelihood level P &lt;..."  line 119: use "Hagberg Falling Number (FN)"  line 120: use "The FN increased ..."  line 128: use the abbreviation "FN"  line 130: appoint at the end of the § following sentence:  "Moreover, according to known hyperbolic dependence of the FN on the □-amylases activity, values over 400 seconds signify such enzymatic activity is limiting to zero."  line 130 – 131: consider inserting a vacant line, or usage of non-numbered subheading in italics: "<i>Rheological properties of composite flour</i>" – the paper will be better readable  line 131-158: within single paragraphs, do not state "...we measured and for this parameter, measured range was..."! Compare your gained results by some percentage or fractions (e.g. "...40% addition caused about one-quarter higher diminishing than 10% one did..."). Moreover, add discussion (+references) about influence of other kernel flour types on the alveograph test results, and also contrast the numbers relatively. Better comparison of the alveograms in a form of plot (figure)! Maybe illustrate just for the control sample and for the flour composites with the lowest and the highest enhancement.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

line 145: use "alternative flour", or "FCKF" ("FC") instead of the full term "fermented cashew kernel flour"  
line 151: why in number "95" in bold? Correct "...in the 30% blend..." to "...in the case of the 30% blend..." as well as "...in the wheat flour..." to "in the case of wheat flour"  
line 159-161: move at the beginning of the chapter (before the alveograph data)

**§ 3.2**

line 171-172: correct numbers to integer (without decimal places), e.g. "208.02 g" to "208 g"; significant differences maintain still clear  
line 174: correct "from 10% -20" to "from 10% to 20%"  
line 183: "heavy loaves": did you mean "less porous" (as you mentioned a function of fermentation gases)?

**§3.3**

line 193: subheading should be **3.3** ...; repair "Composition" to "composition"  
line 201: "...consistence with [31]" repair to "...consistence with article [31]"  
line 234: reference should be [35]

**CONCLUSION**

line 246: correct "10 %"

**Tables**

In general, Tables are not arranged in a appropriate way; I strongly recommend to fix the title as well as footnotes into table by adding empty rows without borders (lines in automatic black) to conjoin all table's parts. Further, you did not maintain the same acronyms for tested samples! In the tested samples order, I prefer the control one as the first – in such case, descending (or ascending) trend could be seen clearly. Also "mean ± standard deviation" should be written with spaces before and after the "+" sign (as in the footnotes). To clarify mixing ratio of wheat flour and cashew one, just one example is enough (perhaps with additional notice "...similarly for other flour composites tested")!

**Table 1**

- title: delete the name Hagberg and a dot at the end of the title; here should be "alveograph parameters"; consider, that "composite blend" means "blended blend" – better "composite flour" or "flour composites"
- heading: not "HF", but "FN"
- footnote: add explanation to "ND" – within the text, a notice why such values were not possible to evaluate is missing!
- as you measured in duplicate and mentioned the Newman-Keuls statistics, variance letters are missing into Table 1!
- **consider transformation of the alveograph data into a form of the line plot**

**Table 2**

- for the bread weight and the volume, number without decimal places are sufficient
- correct "1.8" to "1.80"
- usage of the different abbreviation than defined in § Mats & Meths

**Table 3**

- for the moisture, one decimal places are sufficient (and the one for the parameter Energy)
- add missing spaces to "Fat(%)" and "(kcal/100g)"
- usage of the different abbreviation than defined in § Mats & Meths

**Table 4**

- avoid to decimal commas
- unify a count of decimal places to one only
- usage of the different abbreviation than defined in § Mats & Meths



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

<p><b>Minor REVISION</b> comments</p>	<p><b>General</b></p> <p>a) vary used verbs “increase”, “decrease” by synonymic “rise”, “alleviate”, “elevate” or “fall about”, “diminish”, “descent”, “decline” etc.; avoid “increased amount increased the value...” as in line 180</p> <p>b) within some scientific journals, single past tense is preferred only...</p> <p>c) check the text body and correct upper case letters randomly occurring in the middle (within) sentences (e.g. line 109: “...taste, texture, <b>A</b>roma and...”; line 145: “... and <b>W</b>heat flour..., or split words (e.g. line 127: ...gas (<b>car bon</b> dioxide).”</p> <p>d) strongly recommended abbreviation FCKF for fermented cashew kernel flour (or FC only) – it identified the material clearly</p> <p>e) recommended abbreviation WF for wheat flour – it identified the material clearly</p> <p>f) consider typographic rules as e.g. a number cannot stay alone at the end of the row (without unit), usage of unbreakable spaces etc.</p> <p><b>Remarks</b></p> <p>3. § Introduction, line 46: exchange [6-7-8] by [6-8]</p> <p>4. § Introduction, line 48: positive changes? Please discuss which changes were positive at least.</p> <p>5. § 2.2.3: why do you consider also alveograph feature G? Later, within the § Results and Discussion, you comment the gained results briefly without any effort to render insight in physical base of the matter (five lines only, namely 139-143)</p> <p>6. § 2.2.4, line 92: do you mean slant incisions? How many (how far one from the each other)?</p> <p>7. line 96: explain, why the rapeseed was not used as usual within the Europe; typical case in Africa or Asia?</p> <p>8. line 206: consider, whether the abbreviation “GIT” is not superabundant</p> <p>9. line 207: cashew kernel composition should be mentioned also in the Introduction part</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ivan Švec</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Chemistry and Technology Prague, Czechia</b>