



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_43087
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of the nutritional status and acceptability of powdered reconstituted Kunu-zaki; an index of increasing shelf life
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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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>Introduction: In my opinion the goal of the work is not a reflection of the title of the manuscript. I suggest that the goal and the title of the manuscript should be uniformed. Was this the first attempt to produce a powdered Kunu-zaki drink?</p> <p>Materials & methods: Because the drink is not widely known, I would like to get more details about its production: e.g. soaked in water (?), what temperatures were used for the soaking, drying process, how long was the sedimentation phase. Mineral analysis: Please, give details for HCL and NHO3 concentration and spectrophotometer (company, name). Sensory evaluation: I am missing information on how samples were prepared for sensory evaluation, e.g. how much powder was used for how much water to obtain a ready to drink beverage. Was the proportion of water to powder always the same for different grains? There is no information about statistics methods used while differences are stressed in table 1 and 4.</p> <p>Results: I do not understand large differences in carbohydrate and moisture content in a drink prepared from powder and with traditional method? Especially, that there were not so big differences in the case of protein, fat, ash and fiber. Because carbohydrates were calculated from the difference, was not their content affected by water content? On what basis was the reconstructed drink prepared (quantity of added water)? I do not understand why the mineral composition was assessed for powder, not the ready to drink beverages? Specially, when the in table 1 analyses are made for ready to drink beverages. As the powder is diluted with water (in what amount) it is impossible to guess what is the nutritional value of the Kunu drink. Lines 162-165: in results section the potential effects of minerals should not be discussed, especially when information given without any references.</p> <p>Discussion: lines 210-211 Is mineral content was analysed in powder (as mentioned in Table 4) or in reconstructed powder drinks (as written in line 211)? maybe the differences are due to different water content?</p> <p>The title: I strongly suggest to change “nutritional status” for “nutritional value”</p>	<p>The essence of this work is to extend the shelf life of kunu zaki from 3 days to more than 6 months. Thus, evaluation of nutritional value and acceptability of powdered reconstituted kunu was investigated.</p> <p>The goal and the title of the work has been adjusted to be uniform and this was the first attempt to produced Kunu zaki drink from different grains in the institute using the available resources in the institute.</p> <p>All observations and questions being asked by the reviewer has been effected on the manuscripts.</p> <p>The analysis carried out was done on both powdered Kunu and also powdered reconstituted kunu. Thus, the corrected value of the moisture and carbohydrate of the powdered reconstituted kunu was used</p> <p>All analysis carried out are done on the powdered reconstituted kunu. As it enables us compare it to the conventional mode of kunu preparation.</p> <p>This has been duly effected from the topic. Thank you</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Introduction: line 42: change the capital letter for millet Mineral Analysis: line 77: remove the capital letters for some minerals. Please, use the same form of naming of chemical compounds, e.g. HCL (abbreviation) or sulfuric acid (full name) in the manuscript. Results: In line 109 please indicate that it was power reconstructed Kunu. Line 112: remove the capitol letter for sorghum; line 113 remove the capitol letter for ash; table 1: please uniform the size of letters. I do not understand why in some cases significant differences are stress in order “a” and “b”, in others “b” and “a” (lines 126, 127)? Lines: 146-147 remove the capital letters for grains names.</p>	<p>All observation has been duly corrected and effected on the present manuscript submitted.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>I don't feel qualified to judge about the English language and style but some parts of the manuscript are difficult to follow, partially due to very long sentences. E.g.: lines 33-37; 133-136. There is not Table 3? It is interesting, practical study, but needs more details to clarify the content.</p>	<p>The observations seen by the reviewer was pertinent to the work, although a manuscript that explain some of the question asked has been done on one of my previous journal which is being referenced in this work.</p>