

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_125327
Title of the Manuscript:	Diagnosis of practices and equipment used in the transformation of cassava into attiéké in Banfora, Bobo Dioulasso and Ouagadougou
Type of the Article	Original article

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This article diagnoses and then optimizes the operating energy of a mechanized unit for processing cassava into attiéké. It shows the need to mechanize most processing equipment such as washers, peelers, presses, sieves and dryers.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	No , insert in the summary, the total number of companies visited in this study and cite the practices and equipment identified in the three study areas banfora, bobo dioulasso and ouagadougou	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No , Insert discussion section - Present the practices and equipment used in processing cassava into attiéké and compare them with those in the literature, then explain the differences or similarities. - Highlight the specific practices and equipment used in each of the Banfora, Bobodioulasso and Ouagadougou regions, showing the advantages and disadvantages; - Make recommendations for improving practices and equipment used in the processing of cassava into attiéké.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript clearly presents the study objective, as well as the methodology. The results are well analyzed. There is very little discussion of the results.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	yes	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments	yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Masse Diomande
Department, University & Country	Jean Lorougnon Guede University, Côte d'Ivoire