



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_40037
Title of the Manuscript:	INFLUENCE OF EXTRUSION VARIABLES ON PROXIMATE COMPOSITION SOME NUTRIENT AND ANTINUTRIENT CONTENTS OF DAKUWA EXTRUDATES PRODUCED FROM BLENDS OF SORGHUM (Sorghum bicolour L) GRAUNDNUT (Arachis hypogea L) AND TIGER NUT (Cyperus esculentus)
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	A well-designed and conducted experiment. There is however room for some revision. Lines 87-110: I think this explanation/review should appear in the introduction section, and not in methodology. Lines 321-324: could the author explain better what is meant by the statements 'On the other hand the highest moisture content recorded at design point 20 could be as a result of low percentage of groundnut content 20 % in the blend and high tigernut content of 30 % which is characterised by having high carbohydrate that influences moisture retention.' Exactly how does low groundnut content affect high moisture? Also, how does high tiger-nut carbohydrate moisture retention lead to high moisture content that was recorded? Also, review syntax and punctuations of these sentences.	1) Thank you for your observations 2) Thank you, I wrote it under methodology because it is part of the experimental design in other for it to flow. But if you insist it can be transformed to the introduction section. 3) The reason is because groundnut contains high fat content, and water does not form solution with oil as a result of that water cannot be absorbed in to the extruded because of the high oil content of the extruded. On the other hand high tigernut content in the blend meaning low groundnut content. The low groundnut and high tigernut influences moisture retention because tigernut helps in moisture absorption during extrusion because of its characteristics of low fat and high carbohydrate content. Thank you. But if you fill it can be removed you can suggest that. 4) The syntax and punctuations these sentences were reviewed, thank you
Minor REVISION comments	1. Line 6: 'Graundnut' should be spelt 'groundnut'. Effect throughout. 2. Lines 13-15: review for syntax and punctuations. 3. Line 18: spacing between '..... (49.74 to 64.64 %).' and 'phytic...' 4. Line 81: 'size reduced' should be 'size-reduced' 5. Line 83: 'grits was mix...' should read 'grits were mixed..' 6. Lines 83-84: review punctuations 7. Line 123: punctuations 8. Line 155: there should be spacing between bottom line of Table 1 and the Table 2 title 9. Lines 162-169: review punctuations. 10. Line 280: 'Analysis method of anti-nutritients' could read 'Analytical method of anti-nutritients' 11. Line 296,310: I think there should be spacing before the equation lines to make them stand out. 12. Lines 549-550: punctuation 13. Line 558: 'rule' should read 'role' 14. Line 559: syntax 15. Line 701: 'were' should be 'was' 16. Line 715-716: 'un extrudate' should read 'un-extrudate' 17. Lines 723-725: review for missing word(s), syntax and punctuation.	All the corrections pointed out were properly effected. Thank you
Optional/General comments		