

Journal Name:	Journal of Basic and Applied Research international
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOBARI_12260
Title of the Manuscript:	DEVELOPMENT AND ANALYSIS OF MULTIGRAIN FUNCTIONAL BAKERY PRODUCTS
Type of the Article	

General guideline:

This journal believes that no manuscript should be rejected only based on 'lack of Novelty', provided the manuscript is sufficiently robust and technically sound. Too often a journal's decision to publish a paper is dominated by what the Editor/reviewer thinks is interesting and will gain greater readership - both of which are subjective judgments and lead to decisions which are frustrating and delay the publication. This journal will rigorously peer-review your submissions and publish all papers that are judged to be technically sound.

To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit

this link: (<http://www.ikpress.org/index.php/index/editorial-guideline>)

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that
Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to	In the conditions of soil desertification in many areas of the world, the manuscript has significance for the scientific world that must provide well-documented information to the agricultural field.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is short and includes all the elements that reveal the content of the work.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	The summary must be concise and contain a maximum of 300 words. Try to reduce the introductory part and include the purpose and a phrase related to the working methods or techniques. In addition to the essential data that reflect the results, the summary should include a final conclusion.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is divided into sections and sub-sections, which you should highlight better	
Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? (Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)	I think the data is useful for food science	

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	I suggest completing the bibliography with the most recent references	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The methods are detailed and easy to reproduce. The results are concise. The discussions from the results section are missing (with the exception of sensory qualities) and for figures and tables, the rules in the guide must be respected. The subsections in the results and discussions section are not very well highlighted. The title of the conclusions subsection is missing. Declaration of competing interest and authors' contributions should be mentioned.	

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:	Borozan Aurica
Department, University & Country	University of Life Sciences "King Mihai I" from Timisoara, Romania