



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Advances in Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AIR_21981</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>PROTEIN QUALITY EVALUATION OF WEANING FOODS FORMULATED FROM MAIZE GRUEL 'OGI' AND CRAYFISH USING COMBINED TRADITIONAL PROCESSING TECHNOLOGY.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>I don't think the author(s) carried out this research at all. A lot of irregularities are found in this manuscript like wrong references (2 and 13). Also, the topic never reflected in the body of the manuscript. The topic says "Protein quality evaluation" Nothing like protein evaluation in this manuscript. Even, I don't see any contribution to knowledge in this work because millions of publications are on improved maize gruel all over Africa, not Nigeria alone. This work is not good enough to be published in this journal without those corrections.</p> <p>I will like to point out some important things here</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The introduction read as if the author(s) are the first person to work on maize gruel. No reference to past work done by some good and highly rated researchers in the country.</li> <li>2. Some references are quoted out of context like that of Henshaw who worked on thermal properties of cowpea.</li> <li>3. The materials and method lack originality. So many information missing.</li> <li>4. Using of software to do the formulation. Why?</li> <li>5. Nothing like proximate composition of the formulated food. All what we have was the microbiological aspect and rat feeding.</li> <li>6. I think the author(s) can sit down and work on the manuscript. Crayfish is somehow expensive for some people by so doing cheaper source like underutilize legumes or cereals may be better than Cray fish. Also, Ijarotimi quoted in this manuscript never made the statement credited to him.</li> </ol>	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments		
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Anonymous</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria</b>