



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJBcRR_12859
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of Heat Processing on Nutrient Composition and Energy Values of Selected Cereals Consumed in Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research 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 <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	Authors made real contribution through their excellent work in cereal crops and it impacts the essential roles of legume diet in the human to supplement some minerals without any loss during heat processing. It is useful work in Agriculture and to the scientists in biochemistry and to food and nutrition. Authors used established methods. Introduction is limiting, need to justify by giving some literature showing the roles of minerals, their availability, impact of processing in the related crops. Similar changes must be done in discussion too. For present paper nutrition/dietary values of minerals/energy values are more important with their roles in human health rather than climatic condition for plant growth and production..essential for justification of the present work., please review the similar work done in these crops or related crops.	Noted and introduction updated. Dietary values updated while climatic conditions removed.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Please remove the lines from 50 to 53, rather mention the importance of the maize consumption to the human nutrition/energy values. Same is with rice and sorghum. Paragraph 64-68 not giving any information related to energy values or importance of the present contribution. Kindly mention about the mineral values as you analyzed the mineral values for both cooked and raw, why they were important for human health or nutrition.	Line 50-53 removed. Others removed also. Noted and corrected.
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Spelling mistakes “folder” for “fodder” on line 39, Guinea corn /or sorghum-Use the same name throughout. line 243 Arlingtong instead of Arlington. Please remove sentences like estimated animal production, or connect like by saying increased animal production requires increased maize production..on line 49 and 61.	Corrected. Corrected.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Acknowledgement and author’s contribution were missing. Competing Interest section was NOT Mentioned by authors in the manuscript and was missing	Inserted. Thank you for your review.