



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_4191
Title of the Manuscript:	PHYSICOCHEMICAL PROPERTIES OF SORGHUM BISCUIT ENRICHED WITH DEFATTED SOY FLOUR
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 (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	Abstract The aim should be reframed. Is that ratio able to reduce the PEM? Duration of study was not mentioned Line 26 There should be full stop at the end of that statement after (FAO). Line 27 Central and South America . Capital letter to start the countries name. According to Rooney (Start another statement) Line 31 in which a portion of wheat flour is replacement by locally should be "in which a portion of wheat flour is replaced with locally" Line 99 the formula for whiteness index according to Hsu et al 2003 reported here is wrong. It should be $WI = 100 - \sqrt{(100 - L)^2 + a^2 + b^2}$ Line 106 Kure et al., (1998) There should be no comma again after the et al. since the year is in bracket. Likewise, line 107. Line 137-144 Keys are not necessary since there is a table to that effect. Remove all keys References did not follow the format of the journal Year; vol(no):page e.g. 2013;43(1):31-39	Abstract The aim had been reframed. Rat bioassay was not carried out so as to confirm if the ratio used was able to reduce the PEM. The study was undertaken between January and September, 2012. Line 26 The full stop after the statement is added. Line 27 Capital letters had been used, to start the countries name. Line 31 The sentence is corrected. Line 99 The correct formula as reported by Hsu et al., 2003 is written. Line 106 Comma after kure et al. Is removed. Line 107 Comma removed after Sanni et al Line 137-144 All keys had been removed References followed the journal format.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Other biscuit parameter like crispiness etc was not analyzed. Also, sensory evaluation of the biscuit would have given the consumers view about the product.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The authors have not properly dealt with the subject. There are enough research works on fortification of soybean bean with other flours for biscuit production. The authors should discuss and relate this work with other people's work.	