



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_12667
Title of the Manuscript:	Improved soyabean technologies in processing and utilization adoption as supplement with local foods in Bauchi Local Government Area, Bauchi State, Nigeria
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>)



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	References need to follow this journal style. Ref. on line 329 is 1959 not too old?	The references have been done accordingly. Reference on line 389 (ref 12) cannot be changed it a permanent record
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Can you improve the title? Check line 344 'savannah' 343 'social' use the correct one You can still do better on the result. Your conclusions need to stand out and should not be biased but based on your data.	The title has been improved and effected (lines 1-3). Lines 431-432 on ref 25 'savannah' and 'social' have been corrected. Yes, the result has been improved upon. The conclusions have been corrected (lines 257-266)
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Sufficient details of the methods/process should be provided. Similar to http://www.ajol.info/index.php/ajfand/article/view/65878	Possible details on methods/process is already done