



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_44471
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECTIVENESS OF TRAINING ON FOOD PROCESSING
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>)

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>5: Delete second word "present" and write ... in seven villages "purposively selected" namely.....</p> <p>7: Delete "covered under the project were selected purposively"</p> <p>11: ...followed by "another" 31.73% (Note you either maintain writing (% or percent) and not the two, check through your work again)</p> <p>15: Majority of respondents (please state the percentage)</p> <p>22:gain maximum (maximally)</p> <p>26 - 27: Across the world.....and socioeconomic impact (Kindly cite an authority)</p> <p>35: technical (know – how)</p> <p>38: And packaged food (Cite authority)</p> <p>45:63.4% (Don't start a sentence with figures)</p> <p>49: Include how you got WMS</p> <p>71, 77 and 83: Interpret and add some note. What are the inference from your data, putting the data without brief notes may not be too okay</p> <p>89: delete second word "coverage" or better replace with another word</p> <p>91: It may (can) be seen</p> <p>94: nearly half of respondents (what percentage)</p> <p>106: It looks like a summary. Conclusion should not repeat findings but makes some remarks that serves as contributions to knowledge</p> <p>121: Check spelling</p> <p>122: Increase on your references</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

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:	<i>Ighoro Alexander</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Nigeria</i>