



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Biotechnology Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJI_47429
Title of the Manuscript:	COLOUR PROFILE, PASTING AND SENSORY PROPRITIES OF VARIOUS SWEET POTATO FLOUR
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>Line 2: Check the spelling of 'Properties'. Remove 'various'. You may adopt "Colour Profile, Pasting and Sensory Properties of Sweet Potato Flours".</p> <p>Line 5: Check the spelling of 'Abstract'</p> <p>Line 11: Range is from the least value to the highest value. Please rewrite. Do same for Line 316. Also delete 'in this study'. Put full stop before 'Also' and not comma.</p> <p>Line 11-14: From 'Also.....' This sentence is too long. Put full stop after (p<0.05). i.e. ".....(p<0.05)." ----Also rewrite as "Sample A had a higher value when compared with samples B, C and D."</p> <p>-Delete the sentence 'Amylograph pastingof the samples'. It is irrelevant here.</p> <p>Line 15: Start with "Pasting properties such as peak viscosity,pasting temperature <u>were</u> determined. All the bold words must be in small letters. Please correct all 'viscoucity' to "viscosity" in the text.</p> <p>Line 19-23: Rewrite the sentences for sensory evaluation.</p> <p>-Do not write as 'greater than 6 but less than 7'.</p> <p>-Look at your Table, which one is different significantly?</p> <p>-The figures you put in bracket cannot be found in Table. Please report based on your result in Table.</p> <p>Line 24-25: Rewrite the keywords. What you wrote are not keywords, break it i.e. starter culture,</p> <p>Line 75: Read and rewrite this sentence.</p> <p>Line 103: Specify the wt/vol ratio, i.e. the weight of tubers/ml of water used for soaking. Be specific.</p> <p>Line 104: Sample A is unfermented. Why did you transfer into sterile fermentation bowl? Please write clearly and separate sample A from fermented samples.</p> <p>-spontaneous fermentation, how long?</p> <p>Line 134: After milling and sieving, what next? Didn't you package as claim in Line 184?</p> <p>Line 121-142: Group all the steps in the flow diagram together to avoid scattering. Do same for Line 146-167.</p> <p>Lines 142: What did you modified?</p> <p>Lines 141, 167: Rewrite as "Flow diagram for the production of"</p> <p>Line 199: Specify the chroma meter's company and origin.</p> <p>Line 200: Rewrite 'chromometer' as "chroma meter"</p> <p>Line 202: Change 'L*' (Lightness) to L* (Whiteness)</p> <p>Line 205: HQCF? Are you working on cassava flour? Please correct the sentence.</p> <p>Line 206: Remove the comma before bracket. Write "Shittu <i>et al.</i> (2007)</p> <p>Line 230: Did you carry out hand feel? Check Line 290 (Table 3).</p> <p>Line 256: Please, this is not the way of presenting results. Before you showed any Table or Figure at all, you need to introduce the Table or Figure first and then present your results without discussing and comparing it with any previous works. You may start as "The colour profile of sweet potato flour samples is presented in Table 1". Then continue with your figures. Do this also for other Tables.</p> <p>* Table 1, 2 and 3 should show LSD value for each parameter as you claim in Line 237.</p> <p>Lines 257 and 276: Values are mean±standard deviation of</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Line 6: Rewrite '4' in word i.e. four.</p> <p>Line 10: Colour profile, <u>pasting</u> and <u>sensory evaluation</u> <u>were</u>....</p> <p>Change 'p' and 's' to small letter and 'was' to "were".</p> <p>Check Line 25, there are 2 commas.</p> <p>Line 42:cassava; sixth in terms.....</p> <p>Line 56: Put space before sweet potato.</p> <p>Line 74 should continue from Line 73.objective (not objectives).</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Line 97: Rewrite 'fresh raw sweet potato samples', 'sweet potato tubers' is better. Also indicate the type (cultivar) of sweet potato.</p> <p>Line 98: Put comma after 'State'</p> <p>Line 180: Rewrite as 'dislodged' and join together. Indicate the volume of water (appropriate is not a scientific word).</p> <p>Line 181: How many fermentation bowls? (not various). Did you ferment only for 72 hours? What about Lines 8-9, 153, 164? Let your method be explanatory.</p> <p>-State the oven's model, company and origin/country</p> <p>-the samples were milled using what? And packaged with what?</p> <p>Line 198: Write as "Colour determination of sweet potato flour samples"</p> <p>Line 291: same superscript should be in small letters.</p> <p>Line 310: Remove comma after Smith. Write as "According to Wrolstad and Smith (2010). Do same for Lines 317, 320, 321, 323, 349 and 385.</p> <p>Line 322 should continue in Line 321 for better understanding.</p> <p>Line 329: Delete 'Also', start with "The redness....." You use 'also' twice in a sentence.</p> <p>Line 330: Rewrite as " ...showed a significantsweet potato samples having a"</p> <p>Lines 344, 346, 365: Remove semicolon after the bracket.</p> <p>Line 353: Stick to one word: hours, hrs or h? Correct Lines 374, 381, 392, 399, 446 and 470. Also, check your abstract.</p> <p>Join Line 452 to Line 453.</p> <p>For references: Arrange well according to the journal's format.</p>	
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>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Florence A. Bello
Department, University & Country	University of Uyo, Nigeria