



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	1. Objective 3 – I did not see the activities related to “creating awareness” and neither were the results related to this objective. Consider removing it. 2. Line 26 – appears like repetition and is somehow misplaced. 3. Improve the presentation of your results. In most cases you repeat, in text form, the results that are presented in tables. This applies to line 126 – 130 and Lines 131 – 133 4. Your discussion appears like a repetition of the results. You also need some literature in the discussion, which is missing.	This paper is written for publication. The extension workers will carry out the awareness or campaign on the utilization of soyabean supplementation. This has been corrected. The presentation has been improved upon. It is necessary to give a little explanation on each table with the results apart from the discussion. Recent literatures have been cited
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Line 14 – reword to make it clear. I understand “ From each of the 3 selected villages, 15 farmers were selected’ 2. Line 19 to read “ ranging from 20 to 70 years” 3. Line 20 – specify the average farm size and family size 4. Line 26 – p-values should be in brackets 5. Line 29 bracket the 73% 6. Line 32 – put commas to read “reach out to people, not only in rural area, but also.....” 7. Line 47 – seems to mean Soybean is a	This has been done in lines 13-15 This also has been effected These have been specified in lines 19-22 It has now been done (lines 27-28) It has now been done (lines 29-30) It has now been done (lines 33-34) The sentence has been removed



SDI Review Form 1.6

	vegetable. Reword 5. Line 72- It appears you omitted a figure here – may be number of towns and villages. 6. Line 75 – start with the minimum and then state the maximum temperature.	The accurate numbers of towns and villages record is not available but it is about 26 in number (line 89) It has been corrected
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper was fairly introduced and the study is very interesting. However, the third objective, on creating awareness appears implied. Author should attend to minor mistakes as indicated in the section on minor revisions. Author should also avoid presenting results in both table and text form.	