



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	2014_AIR_15417
Title of the Manuscript:	WASTE-TO-WEALTH APPLICATIONS OF CASSAVA CYANIDE- A REVIEW STUDY OF INDUSTRIAL AND AGRICULTURAL APPLICATIONS
Type of the Article	Review 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>)



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The author(s) highlighted current advances in the utilization of cassava cyanide as far as its industrial application is concerned. They however veered off completely from the subject matter by their inclusion of line 278 to 330 in the discourse. This section should therefore be removed from the article.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The references should be arranged in alphabetical order if that is the stated guideline of the Journal.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Many of the references listed by the author(s) are not cited within the text, also some cited literature are not listed in the references. The author(s) should tidy these up. Since it is a review article, the issue of plagiarism could be reduced to the minimum if the author(s) endeavour to provide relevant citations from literature to back up the article.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Samuel Olanrewaju Aro
Department, University & Country	Department of Animal Production & Health, Federal University of Technology, Akure, Nigeria