



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/BJAST/2252
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimization of the Residence Time and Throughput in a Single Screw Extrusion of Cassava/African yam bean Mixtures.

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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	Abstract needs to be revised. Introduction needs to be improved in the following areas. a) Include some literature on similar works. b) Include how RSM helps to optimize the process variables. Please include some latest reference also on RSM c) Include objectives and indicate how this is different from the earlier research work. Material and methods a) Normally lower temperatures are preferred before extrusion. Why storage temperature of 30C was used in the present study. Does it bring any changes in terms of chemical composition of the material? b) How long are the samples stored. c) Please consider mentioning the details of the extruder used in the present study (compression ration, L/D ratio, etc. screw design like helix angle, etc. These design considerations have a great impact on the quality of the extrudate and flow rate). d) Please include the extrusion process followed in the present study. How uniform extrusion was achieved at different moisture contents. e) Coefficient of determination should be capital R^2 f) Please include the chemical composition of	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	African yam bean to understand better the effect of extrusion process variables on the extrudate properties and flow rate. Results and discussions a) ANOVA analysis of the experimental data presented in the paper needs to be supported with some literature review information. b) Tables 3 and 4 needs to be refined as some of the data presented is not necessary. c) Figures 1 and 2 needs to be improved they are not easy to read in the present form. d) Tables 4 a and b needs to be reduced as some of the data presented is redundant. e) Figures 3 and 4 needs to be improved as they are difficult to read in the present form. f) Discussion section presented is not sufficient needs lot of improvement. g) Conclusions need to be improved with some specific results. h) Authors have mentioned about optimization in the title but there are no details on the procedures followed. i) Summery table for response surface plots and optimization results needs to be included. j) Improve the quality of the references.	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jaya Shankar Tumuluru
Department, University & Country	Biofuels and Renewable Energy Technology, Idaho National Laboratory, Idaho Falls, Idaho, USA