

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_87442
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of African yam bean flour as an extender on the physicochemical and sensory properties of cooked beef sausage
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.journalejns.com/index.php/EJNFS/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>Abstract Line 17.: The expression 'sensory of beef sausage' appears incomplete also 'physicochemical' and 'sensory' in keywords.</p> <p>1.0.:Line 24: Italicise scientific names of plants. Also check the repetition of idea in second sentence of first paragraph line 2 and line 45; lines 29 - 32 and 54 - 56.</p> <p>2.1.: Where an existing method was adopted to conduct a test, the section or subsection should start with mention of task and of method with reference. E.g., The water Holding Capacity was determined with the filter press method of Amadi [1].</p> <p>Table 1. : Provide units of the parameters/items in columns A - E, if unit is same e.g., (g), it should be part of table title.</p> <p>2.2.:Line 1: Sentence should be in the past tense.</p> <p>Line 4: Citation needs to be made of (Fiure 1) in the end of second to the last sentence.</p> <p>2.3:Line 1.: Correct wrongly cited figure 1 to figure 2. Also, if the temperature at which cooked sausage was mainted after cooking (for use in next analyses) is known, it should be stated in line 12.</p> <p>2.6.2. - 2.6.4.: Provide detailed description of tasks, reference and mention of the methods adopted in each.</p> <p>2.7.: Recast paragraph as follows: Data obtained from the analysis was subjected to one-way analysis of variances, in line with the method of Wahua [16]. All means were separated using Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT) at 5% probability level ($p>0.05$) using SPSS version 20.0 software 2011.</p> <p>3.2.: Line 3: Correct the error in value of sample A which was earlier corectly stated.</p> <p>4.0.: Authors should rephrase the second to last sentence of conclusion for clarity as suggested in returning manuscript.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Correct texts highlighted in gren and yellow as suggested in the returning manuscript. 2. Remove texts higlighted in red. 	
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:	Peter Chikezie Ayogu
Department, University & Country	University of Minho, Portugal