



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_48070
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Efficacy of Different Brands of Baker's Yeast Used in Bread production in Jos Metropolis
Type of the 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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The name and the affiliation of the authors are missing.</p> <p>Line 30-31: the sentence „the bread we consume....., is not very clear and must be corrected.</p> <p>Line 36: the following references may be added: Microencapsulation of Baker's Yeast in Gellan Gum Beads Used in Repeated Cycles of Glucose Fermentation, International Journal of Polymer Science, Volume 2017, Article ID 7610420; Physico-chemical characteristics and fermentative activity of the hydrogel particles based on polysaccharides mixture with yeast cells immobilized, obtained by ionotropic gelation, Food and Bioproducts Processing, Volume 104, 2017, Pages 104-123; Encapsulation of Saccharomyces cerevisiae in hydrogel particles based gellan ionically cross-linked with zinc acetate, Powder Technology, Volume 325, 2018, Pages 476-489.</p> <p>Line 84: pH 10</p> <p>Table 2: the caption of this table is not correct. I propose the following caption: pH variation as a function of time at 26C</p> <p>Line 157-158: the authors state that „the CO₂ output for valine active dry yeast and pasha instant active dry yeast were too low as compared to other five samples,.. However, the authors have not perform such type of analysis. How they arrived at this conclusion?!</p>	All the corrections / modifications suggested by the reviewer has been done
Optional/General comments		



PART 2:

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