



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_21981
Title of the Manuscript:	PROTEIN QUALITY EVALUATION OF WEANING FOODS FORMULATED FROM MAIZE GRUEL 'OGI' AND CRAYFISH USING COMBINED TRADITIONAL PROCESSING TECHNOLOGY.
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>Title: Okay</p> <p>Abstract: high nutrient dense??? Delete. Two way ANOVA???? This is not a study design but a statistical analysis tool. Even if statistical design was intended, it may be any of the various block designs and never two way analysis.</p> <p>Methodology: The methodology as reported here is quite confusing and hard to follow. For instance, Germinated-fermented ogi slurry was produced from maize.???? How? This slurry was processed into flours using oven drying and toasting method in order to obtain two different blends (oven-dried and toasted maize gruel crayfish enriched 'ogi').??? Can oven-drying and toasting yield flour without grinding or yield blends without blending/mixing, possibly with a blender? The developed blends were evaluated for microbial quality and tested biologically???? by feeding them to experimental rats. In all, the methodology was not well written, hence may not confer any meaning to the scientific audience. There is need to re-write the methodology and to explain the formulation formula of the different blends. There is also need to explain the design for the animal part of the study part and what was fed the different animal groups. The conclusion is not supported by the study design and results, hence need to be recast and in line with the corrected version of the study.</p> <p>Line 98: Capitalize 'W' in 'wistar' and 'D' in</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>'department' and 'B' in 'biochemistry'</p> <p>Line 256: The study indicated that oven dried enriched <i>ogi</i> and toasted enriched <i>ogi</i> will support growth in 257 children than ordinary <i>ogi</i> which is currently in use as traditional weaning foods in Nigeria.???? Over extrapolation. From rats to humans??</p> <p>Ethical Issue- Animals (rats) were used hence there is need to obtain and state ethical approval for this study.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>The bulk of the fault in this manuscript is within the Abstract section. The author(s) need to recast the abstract to reflect the actual content of the study since abstract tells the whole story in brief.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anthony Cemaluk C. Egbuonu
Department, University & Country	Department of Biochemistry, Michael Okpara University of Agriculture, Nigeria