



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_50605
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of cowpea biscuits on nutritional and cognitive development of pre-school children
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>Introduction: lines 24-27 may be omitted because they do not provide any information to the manuscript. If Authors decide to leave these three sentences, they should add a citation source line 29 - see comment above</p> <p>lines 42-47 - information provided in this paragraph need some citations</p> <p>Materials and methods: lines 78-79 please describe the methodology of measurements (e.g. measuring positions in which children's clothes were measured, measurement accuracy, etc.) line 82 - please add more information about classification of malnutrition (e.g. what weight for age standard has been used?) line 85 - what was the selection of children for 3 groups? lines 91-92 Why was the caloric value of 500 kcal for biscuits determined? It's high calorific value, satisfying a large part of all-day energy demand for children aged 3-5. lines 97-100 - all biscuits were analyzed for sensory acceptability? or only those supplemented with cowpeas? The detailed information on the composition (ingredients used for preparing) of biscuits is missing.</p> <p>Results and Discussion</p>	<p>Lines 24-27 deleted. Reference given.</p> <p>Add three citations in manuscript.</p> <p>Details added</p> <p>Details added</p> <p>the caloric value of 500 kcal for biscuits determined because it made upto one-third of the calorie requirement of preschool- children. Both biscuits were analyzed for sensory acceptability (table 2)</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Introduction: I would appreciate some more information about cowpea, e.g.</p>	<p>Added</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>Adding the word " malnourished " to the title of the manuscript would better reflect the content.</p> <p>I would appreciate if Authors comment on the fact that children who did not received additional 500 kcal/day on the average gained more weight than these who received such amount of calories in control II group? It is quite unusual.</p> <p>The protein content in both biscuits did not differ as much as the content of zinc. Could this be the reason for improving cognitive development tests? Was the age of children in all 3 groups similar? this could have an impact on changes in the parameters tested.</p>	<p>Done.</p> <p>Typing error corrected. (table 3)</p> <p>It is the t stastistic value not the difference value. Hence deleted. The difference between the nutritive value of both biscuits have been added in parentheses.</p> <p>Similar.</p>



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

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