



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJBcRR_12178
Title of the Manuscript:	Functional Properties of Dried Imbrasia oyemensis Larvae Full-fat and Defatted Flours
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. The title should be change to "Protein Fractions and Functional Properties of Dried <i>Imbrasia oyemensis</i> Larvae Full-fat and Defatted Flours" 2. To the keywords add the "Protein fractions" 3. Author (s) must read and follow the authors guidelines 4. In line 64 the word filtrate do you mean residue? 5. You have to show the drying conditions for the residue 6. Line 67 Extraction and fractionation of coconut proteins. ??????????? 7. Line 85 author(s) used a 10 ml stoppered measuring cylinder, then they stated that then distilled water was added to reach a volume of 30 ml. How? 8. In lines 117-118 meant is meant by M0? 9. In lines 124 and 181 how you can centrifuge by using a magnetic stirrer? 10. In line 125 how do you determine the density of the oil? 11. The results in lines 200-201 were differe from what in Table 1. 12. In Table 1 the total of protein fractions for both CF and DF should equal 100. The author(s) must revise their results. 13. The stat. analysis in Tables 1and 2 must be revised and indicated in the table.	1. The title has been changed as recommended by reviewer 2. "Protein fractions" has been added to keywords 3. 4. In line 64 the correct word is residue 5. Drying conditions for residue have been shown 6. In Line 67, it is "<i>Imbrasia oyemensis</i> proteins" and not "coconut proteins" 7. In line 85, it is rather 100 mL stoppered measuring cylinder 8. In line 117, M0 is the original weight of sample 9. In line 124, centrifugation has been rather made by using a spinner 10. 11. This is a mistake. This was taken into account and corrected 12. The total of protein fractions in Table 1 is correct. Because we must also take into account carbohydrates and fats which were not presented in this manuscript. It is therefore the sum of the protein, carbohydrate and fat contents which is equal to 100. 13. This was taken into account and corrected 14. Uncommented and not discussed



SDI Review Form 1.6

	14. The results of the volume and swelling index were not discussed. 15. Table 2 is very complicated and can't be understood by the reader. 16. For some of the results in Table 2 their methods were not mentioned, nor discussed.	results were removed from the manuscript 15. Table 2 has been divided into several tables to allow a better understanding 16. All results that methods were not mentioned and/or nor discussed had been removed from the manuscript
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. In the results text author(s) have to mention the mean only without SD. 2. The reference in line 310 3. In line 346 the word cultivars is not the suitable word here. 4. There are some grammatical mistakes in the paper. The author should revise the paper and check the revised by a language expert.	1. This was taken into account 2. In line 310, the reference has been corrected 3. In line 346, the word cultivars has been removed and replaced by "flours". 4. This suggestion was taken into account.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		