

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_103334
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Analysis on the Proximate Composition of Processed Cassava Products
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:

(<https://www.journalcsij.com/index.php/CSIJ/editorial-policy>)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript can open windows to various scientific research such as; regulation of cyanide levels in consumables, proximate analysis of local product consumed by the community etc.</p> <p>No, the author need to be specific, factors like time and location should be considered. Comparative analysis on the proximate composition of locally processed cassava products, from --- to ----, in Lafia town, Nigeria.</p> <p>Period of sample collection should be indicated in the abstract, because processing methods differs from time to time.</p> <p>Determination of cyanide concentration and its effects should be included in the write up.</p> <p>The results revealed that $p \leq 0.05$, this indicates high precision.</p> <p>There are a lot of recent references in the work.</p> <p>The recommendations can be limited to 2 or 3, most of the factors are similar so can be merged as one, e.g i, ii and v can be merged.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	It is fair.	
Optional/General comments	The author should consider time/period of the sampling, most product produced locally differs in methods of production even when produced by the same individuals.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fatimah Muhammad Kntapo
Department, University & Country	Kaduna Polytechnic, Nigeria