



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_34787
Title of the Manuscript:	Technical sheet of Process of traditional cassava inocula used for attieke productions in south of Côte d'Ivoire
Type of the Article	Original 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	Abstract: Objective of study should be clearly stated and main conclusion of research (evaluations) should be stated. Introduction The literature review on the subject should point out the essence and problems inherent of attieke production process and the effects on the inocula. Materials and methods: 1. The author explained the processing of cassava into attieke without credence to the inocula. Details of activities leading to the results discussed in section 3 should be stated. For instance how total titrable acidity and pH content was determined or referenced. How microbial loading for the respective inoculums was carried with particular reference equipment or apparatus used i.e Include some specifications in materials and instruments used. Results and discussion: Comparison of acclaimed results with results of other research is imperative and should form the basis of discussion Conclusion: Show main conclusion from research with emphases. E.g: line 111- had an acidic pH. The PH is a scale, what is the value? References: 1. Line 114: CNRA is a name of author or Institution or Bulletin? Ref Author, (Year) supposed. 2. Djéni was not referenced in the body of document or is same as Djéni?; the author should be consistent.	Line 111: The pH value was cited in the results, we are in the conclusion we can no longer quote this value The author djéni has been correct Materials and methods have been incorporated Introduction: This is a technical sheet, in the introduction it is necessary to avoid the details. It is in fact like a medicine note if we were in a pharmacy. This is just describe the process of producing an ingredient that is used to make a traditional food that is the attieke Abstract: The objective of this work was to describe the process of production of the the cassava traditional inocula which serves as inoculum for the production of the attieke



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Author should search more literature/references.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The last sentence in section 3 line 100 and 102 should be restructured. It was reported that microbes constituted the bulk inocula (Djeni et al., 2015). The author did not isolation or inoculation of any particular microbes from the content of the methodology. The statement (further contamination) He should be substantiated.	Line 100, 102: Ok this was justified