



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_5000
Title of the Manuscript:	A STUDY ON THE PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION PATTERN OF KUNUN-ZAKI: A CEREAL BASED ETHNIC FERMENTED BEVERAGE OF NORTHERN NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Research paper

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 7 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 <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	The aim of this paper is to analyze the consumption and the production of kunun-zaki. However, there is not enough information about the macronutrients composition of this beverage. Moreover no information about health benefits is available. Authors report that kunun have a limited shelf-life (<24h) but they do not report any study about stability. Page 1, line 11: It is not necessary to write "brackets". You can write: ...67% were female (age, 26-30 yr) Page 2, line 35: May be authors referred gastronomy instead of food? Page 3, line 71-79: Summarize this paragraph because there is a Table with the same information	1. The paper focused on the consumption and production pattern of kunun and this was conducted using structured questionnaire. The micro-nutrient, sensory and microbial content of kunun-zaki had been reported in our publications some of which was cited in this write-up. 2. The suggestion by this reviewer would be misleading. However, the word "while" has been used to replace "and" in order to make the sentence clearer. (see correction on the result segment of the abstract in the revised manuscript) 3. We do not agree with the reviewers' suggestion. However, we observed that the preceding sentence did not end with a full stop "." which we have dully effected. (see line 37 of the revised manuscript) 4. Lines 71-79 have been summarized as suggested by the reviewer. (see lines 80-84 of the revised manuscript)
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments		