



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_30162
Title of the Manuscript:	Acceptability of improved instant cassava-soybean based complementary food by weaning mothers
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	Title: There is no indication that this work is building on a previous one and therefore Authors must delete "improved" since it gives a wrong impression. Materials & Method: Author(s) must explain the basis of the formulations and spell out the role of soybean and mangoes. Modify flow diagrams to clearly distinguish between the products. Authors mention "two way ANOVA for comparing sample treatment and heat treatment..." but the results does not show any such comparison. Please delete the statement Results and Discussions: Author(s) must explain clearly the basis for selecting FSB as the most acceptable product since ANOVA did not show significant differences in acceptability scores (If it was selected based on other attributes please state and justify it in the discussion). Author(s) must revisit the discussions, explain the results well, argue the points out clearly and support with previous works (citations). References: Please provide the missing details in the list of references. Other comments are tracked on the main manuscript	Title: The correction delete "improved" in the title has been effected in the revised manuscript. Materials & Method: The formulation of Cassava to Soybean in the ratio of 3(75%):1(25%) was selected because it was the most preferred formulation from the study by Muoki et al 2012. Soybean was to complement the food (cassava-based complementary food) with proteins while the mangoes improved the flavour of the product. Flow diagrams has been modified to clearly distinguish between the products (Figure 2 and 3). Authors did not delete "two way ANOVA for comparing sample treatment and heat treatment..." because the results in Table 3 shows such comparison. Results and Discussions: Considering their individual mean values for overall acceptability, FSM had the lowest value which therefore makes it the most preferred. On the hedonic scale, 1= like very much 3= neither like nor dislike 3= dislike very much. But the difference between the mean values of the samples are not significant. References: Missing details in the list of references has been provided in the revised manuscript.
Minor REVISION comments	Materials and Methods: Procedures for proximate analysis are approved standard methods and therefore	Materials and Methods: Correction effected in the revised manuscript.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	there is no need writing them out in full. Other comments are tracked on the main manuscript	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	General comments are tracked on the manuscript	