



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_47575
Title of the Manuscript:	Antinutritional Factors Reduction from Cassava (<i>Manihot esculenta Crantz</i>) Roots by Grating or Chipping Processing Technique in Mtwara Tanzania
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>)

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	This work did not propose any new method of preparing cassava different from how the locals do. It rather measured the cyanogen levels in the processed cassava. The author however proposed that lower level of cyanogen is found in the grated cassava than the chips made by slicing. Since the locals process this staple food both ways one would have expected a modification of the chipping method rather than out rightly discouraging the method. However the author has done a thorough work for the benefit of the society.	We appreciate the valuable observation and suggestions which will be considered while continuing providing technical assistance to local cassava processors. Meanwhile, we have proposed the chipping method be used for sweet cassava as it achieves the desired level to safe consumption and can be applied in time of food shortage without causing any problem to consumers.
Minor REVISION comments	Author should check and correct grammatic errors	Our ignorance!, grammatical errors now are taken care of and correction are highlighted with yellow colour in the main text of the revised manuscript
Optional/General comments	Good effort	We appreciate the interests and positive suggestions made to our study.

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	