



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_4782
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF ADDED BAMBARANUT FLOUR ON THE QUALITY OF ACHA BASED FURA
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	This manuscript describes a classical food tech experiment where two components are mixed in different proportions to evaluate the nutritional quality as well as the acceptability of the composed food. In this case is specially important because authors are working with a food used in underdeveloped areas where a supplement of protein or other compound could be vital. Nevertheless, this manuscript has some drawbacks that made the manuscript not valid for publication in the present form. English is not my mother language but I feel that the manuscript is not well written and needs a complete rewriting, improving English grammar. Second, the introduction lacks many important aspects to consider the manuscript relevant. How is the extension of these two crops? It is not well justified if people that may be benefit from this food lacks nutrients in their daily food or if they need an extra supplement of protein. Third, there is no statistic in the manuscript. In the table 2 (chemical composition) there is no an analysis of variance or a mean comparison to see if there are significant differences. There is not an study of the sensory panel. Usually, if the results of some panel members are not good enough, they are removed from the panel. Besides, in Table 3 (Sensory) letters do not correspond with the means. As example, Taste: 6.0 (a), 6.15 (b), 6.6 (c) and 7.55 (d) Ok, but 6.95 (e) and 6.4 (f)???? Fourt, there is no discussion at all about the significance	The paper has been corrected grammatically, statistical analysis now properly put in place and order.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	of the results. In general, authors should show why they took those traits and why the results obtained are important. As conclusion, I like the general idea of this experiment but authors need to rewrite and explain in detail different aspects before consider the manuscript for publication.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		