



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_23670
Title of the Manuscript:	Mycoflora and Moisture Content of Garri Sold in Anyigba, Kogi State
Type of the Article	Original Research Articles

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: Methodology Knowing fully well that there are lots of markets in this study area, I think the authors should specify the two open markets investigated in this study Results Line 16 and 17 is incomplete. There are some information missing.. Conclusion With reference to line 38 – 43, having identified the unhygienic ways of processing this product, the author should give the hygienic methods of processing to avoid contamination. Introduction Line 34 -36. I am sure so many authors would have reported the production process of garri. This paragraph should be summarized in one sentence with appropriate reference and merged with the paragraph above. Line 48,, the word "Search" should be replaced with "Surveillance" Line 50 and 51: <i>Safety and safe handling</i> can be interpreted as repetition. The author should restructure the statement... Line 73: conider should be conidal Results and Discussion Line 80..... Moisture content Or should be changed to OF	Methodology Agree with reviewer and correction effected. Results Agree with reviewer and correction effected. Conclusion Agree with reviewer and correction effected. Introduction Disagree with reviewer. Steps for production of garri were highlighted. Refer to line 34 – 36. From grating to fermentation, dehydrating to frying at high temperature, does are the simple processes for garri production. Line 48: correction effected. Line 50 and 51: Correction effected. Line 73: Corrected. Results and Discussion Line 80: Corrected.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 95 – 96, the word SP., should be sp., not <i>sp.</i>, table 3: ditto: line 109----- ditto *****IMPORTANT***** This article is good although the scientific depth of the study is shallow. The authors should try to broaden the scope of similar study in the future. They should consider the proximate and full mineral analysis of the samples. <i>Moreover, the authors should give reasons for the different fungal counts of the two samples (White and Yellow).</i> <i>Authors should also try to consider providing the results with respect to the markets and discuss them independently. I am sure the marketers in the two markets have different ways of handling there products.</i>	Line 95 – 96: Corrected. However, ‘sp.,’ can be replaced with ‘spp.,’ since the former is singular and the latter, plural. Table 3: corrected.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		