

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_84707
Title of the Manuscript:	QUALITY EVALUTION OF NIGERIA BASE -MASA FROM BROKEN RICE ENRICHED WITH AFRICAN YAM BEAN AND CRICKET FLOUR 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:

(<https://www.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-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	<p>The paper presents an interesting research theme. In general, I rate the work high. I encourage you to continue this research objective. However, there are some shortcomings that need to be corrected.</p> <p>There is an error in the abstract regarding the tests performed (marked in the text of the manuscript).</p> <p>Please enter the name Masa either in quotation marks or without throughout the text (marked in the text).</p> <p>The first paragraph of the introduction contains the same sentence twice (marked in the text).</p> <p>In section 2.1, the name of the author is indicated, not the surname. Similar in two other places (indicated in the text).</p> <p>Please check whether the references to the figures in the text correspond to their actual numbering - for example figure 2 (marked in the text).</p> <p>In the results and discussion chapter, the names of the subsections must be moved above the tables they describe (to which they refer).</p> <p>Please provide the numerical values obtained during the experiment up to three significant places.</p> <p>Chapter 2.7 (highlighted in the text) needs to be improved.</p> <p>Please indicate on what basis the content of anti-nutritional compounds has been classified (some standard?) Are these values safe?</p> <p>In the conclusions, the mentioned variants should be checked and a utilitarian conclusion should be added.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The addition of technological parameters for the production of flour and powder, as well as the dough itself, would definitely facilitate the reception and understanding of the entire production process.</p> <p>Better graphic preparation of technological diagrams would have a positive impact on the reception and aesthetics of manuscript.</p> <p>Adding (standardizing) references to figures and tables throughout the text would improve its reception.</p> <p>Please indicate the full name of the permanganate.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>When giving the names of chemical compounds (reagents), it would be useful to provide their formula and the manufacturer of the reagent.</p>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Daqmara Migut
Department, University & Country	University of Rzeszow, Poland