



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BMRJ_23495
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of fermentation and extrusion on the proximate and organoleptic properties of cowpea-plantain flour blends
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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	Line 1: the author talks about the 'nutritional properties' whereas the parameters assessed are related to the chemical composition. From the introduction, the neither the justification of the mixture of plantain and cowpea flours nor the treatments (fermentation and extrusion) are not clear. Their importance concerning the improvement of food quality as well as the need of the combination of fermentation and extrusion and the aspect of food quality improve by these treatments are not highlighted. During production of plantain and cowpea flour, which rate of raw material was retained by sieve? Was particular equipment used for sieving? Fermentation and extrusion: 1) Describe the containers in which fermentation was carried out and the quantity of sample introduces in any container and give the temperature of fermentation. Were the samples homogenised during fermentation? 2) give the parameters of extrusion Line 82: check the temperature of storage (382°C). Line 91: describe the measurement of pH Results and discussion: the samples must be codified base on experimental design in methodology prior to the use of the whole codes in results and discussion. Complete the value of the results on proximate composition with the appropriated units basing on dried matter. Lines 240 to 243: what is the source of the microorganisms found in these products? Are there characteristics of this type of product? Conclusion: from this work what is the treatment for the better improvement of the quality (principal responses) of the blends?	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 15: precise the direction of pH and total titrable acidity variations Line 31 to 33: actualise the data concerning the production of plantain in Central and West Africa. Use the recent data. Line 41 and 50: precise in which context these foods are 'traditional'. Line 58 to 59: describe with more details the collection of sample: locality, period of sampling, the strain and the age of plantain used Line 61: precise the nature of water used Line 62: precise the thickness. 72 h of sun drying is the time of the exposure of the slices to sun or the drying was carried out for 3 days? Line 72: why the medium is considered as semi-solid? Lines 72 to 77: what are the water absorption capacities of the both flours? Line 77: the sample was mixed using spatula? Lines 88 to 89: briefly describe the methods used to identify microorganisms. Lines 116 to 122: give the results of microorganisms isolated in respect to different samples fermented. Results and discussion: Highlighted the effect of different factors and their interaction on each response measured using statistical analysis. Describe the general evolution of one response, no point by point description. Check the police on figures and give the composition of blend using proportion and not the mass of constituents (100% and not 100g for instance). Group the results concerning proximate composition of different samples in one table and remove the figures related to these parameters Line 148: replace 'composition' by 'content' and 'protein' by 'moisture' Lines 150 and 153: replace '-' between A and C by 'to'. Lines 157, 165, 173, 180 and 187 replace 'composition' by 'content'. Line 254: why moisture is consider as 'stable'? Line 290: replace 'fat content' by 'fat' Lines 319 to 320: this is possible when during fermentation substrate is soaking and the surrounding water is free, and is not the case in this study where the medium is 'semi-solid', find another justification for the ash content reduction during fermentation in this study.	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 334: delete the repeated 'blend'	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The effect of substitution rate of plantain flour by cowpea flour is almost absent in results and discussion even in conclusion as well as the effect of the interaction of different factors on the responses.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tatsadjieu Ngoune Leopold
Department, University & Country	University of Ngaoundere, Ngaoundere, Cameroon