



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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The author(s) need to be more precise when describing a method in their experiment. For measurement of fermentation rate, author can not say they add a pinch of sucrose, or one teaspoonful of yeast. One pinch of sucrose can be 0.2 g or 0.5 g, which can affect the result. They have to used an exact unit, e.g. 1 g, 10 mL etc. If the author(s) do not use a precise measure, the experiment can not be repeated and therefore violate the repeatability principle of an experiment as a requirement of a scientific experiment. 2. The age of each of the dry yeast can also affect the viability of the cell. Author should include the production date of each of the dry yeast they used in the experiment to make sure that they are around the same age. 3. The author(s) need to check the standard deviation between the measurements of each brand. By doing this author(s) can run statistical test whether the viability of fermipan indeed significantly lower compared to the other brand. The standard deviation presented in Table 1 doesn't have any statistical meaning. If the author consider the standard deviation has statistical meaning, it means that fermipan (99.4 ±0.4) is most likely does not significantly different from the other brand (100±0.4). 4. The author present change in pH as fermentation rate data. This is hard to accept since pH is rarely used as indicator for rate. Rate is related with reduction of substrate or addition of product. Author(s) should measure the concentration of glucose or ethanol over the fermentation time instead. 5. Line 156: On the conclusion section the author(s) wrote: "The indicator of yeast activity is carbon-dioxide production coming from decomposition of carbohydrate, the CO₂ output for valine active dry yeast and pasha instant active dry yeast were too low when compared with the five other brands of yeast and therefore should be considered for economic reasons." → from which part of the experiment did the author(s) can conclude this? I did not see any data presenting CO₂ production. 6. Please check the cited references and the references list. Some cited references are not present in the references list. e.g. Onuorah <i>et al.</i> (1983), Monica (1987), Brown and Booth (1991) and more. 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The author need to mention that Jos is a city (where?). Not all the reader familiar with the city. 2. Line 16: degree sign should not use superscripted "0". The author(s) can find degree sign on symbol list. 3. Line 29: Please check the referencing style 4. Line 31: sentence need to be improved. It require a comma in the sentence in order to make the sentence clear 5. Line 34: second word of scientific name should not be capital 6. Line 72: the author(s) need to mention the concentration of methylene blue used in their experiment 7. Line 106: the fermipan is significantly WHAT compared to the other brand? 8. The author need to check for typo in the manuscript, e.g. PH should be pH, etc. 	
Optional/General comments	The author(s) measure viability and fermentation performance of commercial dry yeast. As far as I am concern, there is an issue in the method they used for the determination of rate of fermentation as mentioned on the Major revision comment. The data presented also too few, only two data. I suggest the author(s) add more data and therefore can discuss more their results.	

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:	Safri ishmayana
Department, University & Country	Universitas Padjadjaran, Indonesia