



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_35736
Title of the Manuscript:	Proximate, Mineral, Sensory evaluations and shelf stability of chinchin enriched with ugu and Indian spinach vegetables.
Type of the 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	Sentence: “Snacks are important for small children and a few adults with very high calorie needs, who do not eat enough food at meals to grow, heal or perform. “ is repeated at lines: 25-26 and 32-34 Line 37: (Adegunwa, 2014) is incorrectly cited Line 50: what (ref) is? Line 175: elements or mineral constituents not: Minerals Line 176: The determination of selected elements or selected mineral constituents not: The analysis for mineral elements Line 177: Spectrometry rather than Spectrophotometry Line 184: Shelf Stability <u>Text</u> ? Line 390: content from 4.97 to 61.97 % - such zinc content is impossible, the sentence should be corrected. Lines 591-594: sentence: “There was an increase in the mineral contents; calcium (16.26 to 161.57%), potassium (32.57 to 62.99%), magnesium (26.61 to 131.33%), iron (14.48 to 30.49%) and zinc (4.97 to 61.97%) of enriched chinchin samples. “ should be rephrased. Line 315: (Doherty, 2011) is incorrectly cited Line 629: ref. Edema, M.O, Sanni, L.O, and Sanni A.I. (2005) is not cited in the text Line 632: citation of ref. Emmanuel-Ikpeme, C, Eneji, C. and Igile, G. (2012) cannot be found in the text Line 655: citation of ref. Iwegbue, C. M. A. (2012) cannot be found in the	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	text Line 659: ref. Jonnalaggada, P. R, Bhat, R. V, Sudershan, R. V, Naidu, A. N. (2001) is not cited in the text Line 664: ref. Kure, O. A, Bahago, E. J and Daniel, E. A. (1998) cannot be found in the text Line 702: Premavalli et al., <u>what about others?</u> (2001)	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The article fits into the Journal's scope. The text is adequately written, although writing should be polished. Editorial mistakes can be easily corrected. The main disadvantage is lack of: determinations accuracy verification and discussion of the results precision. • Plagiarism issue: I have no access to Scopus base right know. However, see for several similarities: 1. Proximate Composition and Sensory Qualities of Snacks Produced from Breadfruit Flour, Global Journal of Science Frontier Research Biological Sciences Volume 12 Issue 7 Version 1.0 Year 2012, Ajani Alice O., Oshundahunsi O.F., Akinoso Rahman, Arowora Kayode A, Abiodun Aderibigbe A & Pessu Patricia O 2. Effect Of Substitution Levels On The Physicochemical And Sensory Properties Of Cake And Chin-Chin Made From Wheat/ Cocoyam Flour Blends, This article can be downloaded from http://www.ijfans.com/currentissue.php 3. Production and acceptability of <i>chinchin</i> snack made from wheat and tigernut (<i>Cyperus esculentus</i>) flour <i>Cogent Food & Agriculture</i> (2017), 3: 1282185, Abiodun Omowonuola Adebayo-Oyetoro, Oladeinde Olatunde Ogundipe, Funmilola Kehinde Lo nmakin, Femi Fidelis Akinwande, Deborah Oladotun Aina and Samuel Ayofemi Olalekan Adeyeye	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anna Leśniewicz
Department, University & Country	Analytical and Metallurgical Chemistry Division, Wrocław University of Science and Technology, Poland