



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_48791
Title of the Manuscript:	Physico-chemical and nutritional evaluation of cookies with different levels of Rosehip and Hibiscus powder substitution
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the abstract : in conclusion it should be concluded that the substitution of wheat flour by rose hibs and hibiscus powder will increase the health benefit of cookies in term of crude fiber content, antioxidant activity and bioactive compund not the nutritive value 2. In the methods section there must be justification about the proportion of cookies 3. In the discussion section there must bu justification or relevant references related to the results of this research, example for physical properties and sensory analysis 	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The methods section, the analysis of anthocyanin and total flavonoid content should be completed with the calculation methods 2. In the result section, the protein contentdid not differ from each other, therefore no need to say that the crude protein content was detected significantly increased 3. In the conclusion, it is better to state what is CF2, not code, it is inconvenience to read up and down to see what is the code for. 	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper evaluates the physicochemical and nutritional of cookies with the different levels of rosehip and hibiscus powder substitution, and it is significantly important both for science and for industry. However, in my point of view, the paper does need some revisions before publication.	

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:	Elisa Julianti
Department, University & Country	Indonesia