



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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Unless the journal format specifies this, the abstract needs to be an actual abstract, not a mini paper. The statistics description doesn't make sense. What test was used? What is the standard deviation of the moisture content samples? How were the samples selected? This manuscript needs some serious statistical explanation. As it stands, it reads as simply the authors going to a market and selecting samples to test. This is not statistically sound! There is no discussion of the specific analysis used, nor of significant differences or standard deviation.	Abstract follows journal's specifications. Samples were randomly selected (refer back to manuscript). Random sampling method. As regards your last comment, you haven't made your point clear. Be more specific and draw home your point from the point of view of a statistician you have portrayed yourself as. I however would want to point out that this is a microbiology based research not statistics.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		I suggest that subsequently, manuscripts for review should be given to reviewers with knowledge in the appropriate field.