



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_52843
Title of the Manuscript:	A comparative assessment of quality features and Physicochemical Characteristics of Rice Bran Supplemented Bread with Locally Available Bread
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/journal/30/editorial-policy>



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>My comments are as follow:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In all the Tables and numbers of your manuscript, I suggest to work with two decimals for numbers with one number before the "decimal point" (for example, in Table 4, 4.51 it is OK), with one decimal for numbers with two numbers before the "decimal point" (for example, in Table 5, round to 92.1 instead of 92.14), and with one decimal for numbers with three or more numbers before the "decimal point" (for example, in Table 4, round to 150 instead of 150.18). You can do the same with all the numbers in the manuscript text. In all the Tables of your manuscript, I suggest to include a "one-way analysis of variance" (ANOVA) between the variable responses and the factors (treatments), and if that analysis is significant ($p\text{-value} < 0.05$), use a pairwise mean comparison performed using Tukey's test to determine the significant effect of the independent variables (factors) on the response variables above-mentioned. The treatments and their interactions can be compared at 95% confidence interval. Statistical software that you can use are: Statgraphics, Statistica, Minitab, R, and so on. If you use this statistical suggestion, you can conclude for example that for the supplemented of different varieties of rice bran with wheat flour have or not statistical differences for the: i) analysis of nutrient compositions of prepared bread (Table 1), in the solubility of protein in prepared rice bran bread (wheat flour and rice bran) in different solvents (Table 3), and so on. In all the Tables of your manuscript, I suggest to include the standard deviation or standard error of the mean. Please, you have to do the discussion about your results of Table 3, 4, 5 and 6. What about your results comparing with other papers? In Table 6, what means this number "1.38.00"? Improve the presentation of the references in your manuscript. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	I enjoyed reading the manuscript entitled "A comparative assessment of quality features and Physicochemical Characteristics of Rice Bran Supplemented Bread with Locally Available Bread". Manuscript is well organized but some proposed changes should be done. Some details in the Material and Method, and all the manuscript sections should be completed. In my standpoint, is accepted with major comments.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Christian R. Encina-Zelada
Department, University & Country	National Agrarian University La Molina, Perú