



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Food Science Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_44458
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECTS OF NATURAL AND INOCULATION FERMENTATION ON THE ANTINUTRIENT COMPOSITION OF AFRICAN WALNUT ENRICHED WITH CARROT
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Some suggestions are given below:</p> <p>In abstract, The values in lines 11 and 12 may be deleted and sentence be reframed accordingly.</p> <p>In line 15 <b>all</b> to be deleted</p> <p>In Introduction</p> <p>African to be replaced by Africa</p> <p>In line 6 the sentence "African walnut.....over the years" to be deleted and replaced by the sentence The plant is decorative and possess nutritive, medicinal, agricultural and industrial values (add references)</p> <p>Line 11 ground as grounded and Turn as turned</p> <p>Line 16 delete <b>against their seeds being eaten</b></p> <p>Line 22 – 29 appears to be one sentence which is too long. It should split into 2 or 3 sentences.</p> <p>Line 31 improve instead of improved</p> <p>Line 33 was aimed in place of will</p> <p>In Materials and methods</p> <p>2.3</p> <p>Delete <b>each</b> in line 6</p> <p>2.4</p> <p>Line 3 - 2.8 gram (70%) as 2.8 gram (70%)</p> <p>Second para</p> <p>T of the in first line should be in capital</p> <p>I of Inoculation to be small</p> <p>Contamination instead of contaminations</p> <p>2.7</p> <p>Small d for Determination</p> <p>Results</p> <p>First line to be rewritten as The biochemical.....characteristics of the bacterial isolates are presented in Table 3.</p> <p>Properties in place of <b>reactions</b></p> <p>In third line features to be added after characteristics</p> <p><b>Is shown in Table 4</b> to be written as are given in Table 4.</p> <p>T of Table in capital</p> <p>Second para in and not <b>on</b> (first line)</p> <p>Third para 4 line</p> <p>Using BLAST with instead of with BLAST in</p> <p>F of figure in capital</p> <p>Candida albicans in italics</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>Line 6</p> <p>Rewrite as The organisms.....samples using biochemical test were identified to be .....</p> <p><i>chrysogenum</i> and not chrysogenium</p> <p><i>Alternaria alternata</i> and not <i>aletrnate</i></p> <p>The last sentence of para 1 is too long so split it into two</p> <p>Put full spot after (19). These observations are in agreement in stead of and this also agrees</p> <p>Second para last sentence delete <b>that is probable</b></p> <p>Conclusions and references in caps with same font size as other headings</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Some corrections are also suggested in Tables</p> <p>Table 2 characteristics instead of characterization</p> <p>P of Plantarum to be small letter</p> <p>Table 4</p> <p><i>chrysogenum</i> and not chrysogenium</p> <p><i>Alternaria alternata</i> not <i>alternate</i></p> <p>Table 5 : Molecular..... yeast should be above the actual table</p> <p>Figures</p> <p>Key should be common for all figure inorder to avoid repetition and also save space</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>The manuscript is nicely written and results are well represented with the help of tables and figures. Results are discussed properly with the help of available literature</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Pushpa Dahiya</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Maharshi Dayanand University, Haryana</i></b>