



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_8596
Title of the Manuscript:	Identified Flow Problems in Adding Value to Cassava Tuber
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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	This manuscript must not be accepted to publish	A research in cassava mash properties needed in engineering design. It should be published
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The references utilized are from non scientific sources. Figures have low quality. English does not meet the scientific quality	Experiments in food engineering Improved upon now UK English edited
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Abstract - This manuscript has no Study design, Place and Duration of Study and methodology is not clear. Introduction: This item is too long, with inappropriate figure and unnecessary extra item (background) its completely out of the journal standart. Matherial and Methods: Results and Discussion: The results could be further explored, many details have been omitted in the discussion, which is not based on scientific references. This item does not support the conclusions. Conclusions: the results does not support this conclusion. References: The references are not in accordance with the Journal standart, besides they have low scientific quality	Ammended