



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

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	A simple method to make glucose syrup by using enzymatic hydrolysis (from sorghum malt) on the sweet potato is an important technology in some country. There are several suggestion for this manuscript are listed as follows:	Noted
	Abstract: erase (5) after "five", and erase sentence "There were variations in the chemical ... and sweet potato flour used", due to the repeated words. Add "(1:4)" after the "lowest ratio"; but actually 1:4 is the highest ratio of SM:SPF.	Noted
	Line 54-55: I would suggest the authors could discuss the advantage of technological development in this study in comparison with other similar research.	Noted
	L. 58: change "wee" to "were". Give the source of sodium meta-bisulphite.	Noted
	L. 71-72: erase "(5)", "produced" after "of", "used" after "bisulphite".	Noted
	Table 1: except the changing ratio of SM/SPF, the water content of mixture had also been changed in the experimental design. I would suggest the authors shall give some comment on this experimental arrangement and its possible effect on the results.	Noted
	Sec. 2.4 – 2.9: shall summarize as a simple sentence.	Noted



SDI Review Form 1.6

	L. 105 and L. 115-116: I would suggest the authors shall discuss the effect of initial water content on the moisture content of samples. L. 107 and Table 3: it is difficult to obtain the “zero or near zero” standard deviations of measuring physicochemical parameters in Table 3 from the “triplicate” experiment of preparing SM/SPF mixtures. The authors shall mention the triple duplication of measuring sample’s parameters or the triple replication of measurement from different sample preparation. L. 130-132: there were no standard deviation and no LSD test on the brix values to conclude the “no significant differences between the brix values”. L. 134-135: change to “samples of glucose syrup”. Reference: “HACH (1990)” did not show in the text.	Noted Noted Noted Noted
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	I would suggest add a sentence to describe the unique or important contribution of this study in the abstract. L. 126-127: I would suggest the authors could discuss the possible reason of effect of SM:SPF ratio on the acid content of samples.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		