Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**South Asian Journal of Research in Microbiology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_SAJRM_69401**
Title of the Manuscript:	**EFFECTS OF FERMENTATION AND EXTRUSION ON THE ANTINUTRIENT COMPOSITION OF UNRIPE PLANTAIN AND PIGEON PEA BLENDS**
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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy)

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. Introduction:** Nothing is said on anti-nutrient properties or composition. Its definition, advantage or disadvantages. It's effect on human health. So why carry out the study of these effect of the anti-nutrient properties?? **2. Material and Methods:** **Section 2.4** what is the reason for choosing the 3 formulations (100, 70:30 and 50:50 of unripe plantain flour and pigeon pea flour)? The choice was based on what? (justification) **3.**Is the formulations in proportions (percentages) or in amount (grams) choose one and be uniform with it. **Section 2.5** **4.**Why did you separate the formulation in batches (justification)?? The batches **(first batch**: preconditioned/fermented, **second batch**: extruded flours, **third batch**: fermented/extruded flours and **fourth batch**; unfermented/ unextruded flours. **5.** The mentioned batchs in the abstract changes in this section: Maintain the same idea of batches in the materials and methods for better comprehension. **section 2.8:** Anti-nutrient properties (phytate, alkaloid….etc) where not mentioned in introduction and of what importance are there??. **3. RESULTS:** what does significance difference ($p<0.05$) imply/how is it obtained or calculated? ➢ The different batches used in this section is still confusing. Are we still in the 1^{st},2^{nd}, ….4^{th} batch. Why separate them in so many other batches. ➢ The code for the batch should be infront of the table for better understanding. **4. Discussion:** Certain discussions are lacking such as why does extrusion cooking reduces phytate levels. What are the best anti-nutrient properties for human health (level for each be it high or low and to what value)? Why fermentation and extrusion reduces antinutrient composition. Does this imply low anti-nutrient composition or properties are good for human health. If yes justify **5)Conclusion:** Ok	
Minor REVISION comments	**1. Material and Methods:** **Section 2.3**. Blowing air into something to separate is called winnowing. 2.4. Its formulation and not formation **2.6.** Nutrient Agar (NA) that capitalise before abbreviating Values should be separated from the units (especially for temperature, concentration, masses) . **2.7.** Equation or formulae should be number and on a separate line (e.g for TTA) **2.8.2** Is 2 N for normality or molarity??? What is a BCG solution (it's an abbreviation for what??) **2.8.3.** It's re-extracted not re extracted	
Optional/General comments	For the section results. In my opinion it was better to give the results and then directly discuss the results for a better comprehension.	

PART 2:

	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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**YANU Celestine ASOBO**
Department, University & Country	**Cameroon**