



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_47647
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>SOLID STATE FERMENTATION OF PLANT PROTEIN MEALS USING <i>Lactobacillus acidophilus</i> FOR IMPROVING FEED VALUE</b>
Type of the 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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p><b>Calculations and statistical analysis</b></p> <p>There is no need to state the hypotheses, remove/delete this The null hypothesis for the analyses of fermented and non fermented variants of the plant protein meals are as follows:</p> <p>1. Ho=There are no significant differences between the proximate composition of fermented and non fermented bambaranut meal Ha=There are significant differences between the proximate composition of fermented and non fermented bambaranut meal</p> <p>2. Ho=There are no significant differences between the proximate composition of fermented and non fermented African yam beans meal Ha=There are significant differences between the proximate composition of fermented and non fermented African yam beans meal.</p> <p><b>MATERIALS AND METHODS</b></p> <p>You only made mentioned method you used to carry out proximate analysis. What about (Anti-nutritional factors and Mineral compositions). Use the following subheading:</p> <p><b>Proximate analysis</b></p> <p><b>Anti-nutritional factors</b></p> <p><b>Mineral composition</b></p> <p><b>RESULTS</b></p> <p>State only your result and emphasis more on significant. Remove these from your results (Consequently we discard null hypothesis, Raw bambaranut meal is a good source of calcium.). Take this to materials and methods (The temperature of the fermented meal increased constantly from 28.6°C to 34°C through the period of solid state fermentation). In your table “±” is standard error, standard deviation or what? 3 &amp; 4 state the SI unit of your parameters, though was stated in article but it must reflect in your table too. Discussion (Solid state fermentation of BNM and AYB was useful in upgrading their nutritive values) Remove leave it in your conclusion. Bambaranut does not contain much lipid but between 3.11±0.01% to 9.0% [45]. You are quoting someone work when actually you recorded 7.11±0.01 and 14.29±0.05 for raw and fermented respectively. (The fatty acid contained in BNM acids are mainly polyunsaturated components like linoleic acid (18:2) 44%, linolenic acid (18:3) 21% [45]. BNM also has saturated fatty acid like palmitic acid (16:2) 30% [45].) there is nothing like this in your work please remove it.</p>	<p>The hypothesis is removed</p>



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p>Change “Cupper” to “Copper” be consistent. Change “.Table 3 Effects of solid state fermentation on the mineral and antinutritional factors of bambaranut meal” to “Minerals and anti-nutritional factors of Raw and Fermented Bambaranut meal”, “Table 4 Effects of solid state fermentation on the mineral and anti nutritional factors of fermented African yam bean” to “ Minerals and anti-nutritional factors of Raw and Fermented African yam bean” .</p> <p>Results There was general increase in the mineral composition of solid state fermented AYB, raw AYB (Table 4). Recast the statement</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The research is well written but seem like confirmatory research, author mentioned some previous works similar to what research dwell on. I suggest the author should improve the manuscript by focusing more on differences (Methodology/Findings/Results) with others studies this will bring out the unique of the manuscript.</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<p><b><u>Reviewer’s comment</u></b></p>	<p><b><u>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)</u></b></p>
<p><b><u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u></b></p>	<p><b><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></b></p>	