



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/IJBcRR/2247
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of Variations of Sorghum malt/ Sweet Potato flour ratio on the Quality of Glucose Syrup produced through Enzyme Conversion activity of Sorghum Malt.

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

	Line 63: 48 hours → 48h Line 71: Change “different samples of produced glucose syrup” to ‘different samples of glucose syrup’. Lines 76-78: Table 1 Column 3: Express the weight of sweet potato flour also in ‘g’ for better clarity as: 750, 625, 500, 375 and 250 Column 4: Decimals put three places uniformly for all values. Column 5: Decimals put two places uniformly for all values. Column 6: Ratio of SM to SPF 1:6.6 for Glucose syrup B may be corrected as 1:6.58 Lines 81-98: Since all the methods adopted are from Onwuka (2005), these shall be clubbed under one sub-head as: 2.4. Analytical methods The various parameters like moisture, ash, dextrose equivalent, acid content, pH and brix value were determined by the methods described by Onwuka (2005). Results and Discussion Lines 102-103: Bring Table 2 also under Results and Discussion section. Line 105-106: Change as : ‘The results showed that significant differences existed between moisture and ash contents, dextrose equivalent, pH as well as acid contents of the five samples, except the brix values, where no significant difference was noticed’. Lines 114-125: References cited like Hug et al., 1993 (Line 116), Chinaka, 1997 (Line 119) and Walter et al. 2000 (Line 125) have no relevance to the statement of results from this particular study. Authors should try to correlate their results with those of previous workers on the specific	Noted Noted Noted Noted Noted Noted Noted Noted Noted Noted
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	findings. Line 118: Include, Table citation as (Tables 2&3) Line 129: What is the point in including the citation Aba et al., 2004 for this result? Recast the Results & Discussion section, including relevant reported findings, even though it is for alternative crops such as cassava or cereals. Line 128: Change 'would slightly' to 'would <u>be</u> slightly'. Line 132: Change are to <u>were</u>.	Noted Noted Noted Noted
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	As indicated above for grammatical corrections	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript contains only a small piece of information and hence shall be accepted as a 'short note' only. There are a number of corrections, which shall be incorporated before acceptance.	