



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBcRR_21681
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF GRINDING PLATES (GUK, PARPELA and PREMIER) ON MAIZE FLOUR MILLED WITHIN SAMARU, NIGERIA
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 <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	Please include the statistics in the results part. The Tables do not show significant differences between levels. On the Figures there is no SD and significant differences included. Please make the analysis on the raw maize without milling and treat it as control sample. Update the references – please make that 90% of references will be no older than 5 years. The photos are unnecessary. What is the application of your research? What you recommend to the mill producers?	Analysis of the data was done using One-way ANOVA as shown in Table 4. The tables show the concentration values of heavy metals and SD ($\pm$). Raw maize ground using porcelain mortar and pestle was used as control as indicated in the sample collection and preparation section and the result presented in the tables under the control column. The photos removed.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	In the Table 1 – first milling, second milling etc., implies that the same maize was milled once, twice etc. Or are there the types of something other?	– first milling, second milling etc., implies that the same maize was milled once, twice and trice as indicated in the sample collection and preparation section.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	There is a methodology issue: please write what was the maize manufacturer – it was the same for each samples? Please format the text properly.	The source of the maize now indicated in the sample collection and preparation section.