



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_26420
Title of the Manuscript:	Organoleptic and Horticultural characterization of Selected Elite Plantain (<i>Musa paradisiaca</i> L) cultivars for value addition and food security in 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 (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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	In line 588 and Line 594 Reference 12 has been repeated twice. This means that the entire reference in the text has to be revised in the main text as it will affect the subsequent numbering of references. e.g Line 594 INFOMUSA will Be 13, line 596 IITA will be 14 and so on....This needs to be corrected.	Thanks so much for your painstaking review and valuable review comments in the correction of our manuscripts. All the references have been duly incorporated after deleting the repeated reference.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 8 – “For increased income” instead of “ for increase income” Line 48 – Only single fullstop required. Line 56 – “serve as a guide” instead of “search as a guide” Line 58 – “serve a baseline” can be replaced by “provide a baseline” Line 61 – “waste and losses” can be replaced by “wastage and losses” Line 76 – “Plantain (<i>Musa paradisiaca</i> L) is undoubtedly” to be replaced by “Plantains are undoubtedly” because the scientific term is already addressed in line 67. Line 134 & 136 – in situ must be in italic font. Line 136 – “The over 300” to be replaced by “Over 300” Line 259 – Method of drying may please be mentioned. Line 452 – should be “was determined” instead of “was determine” Line 487 – should be “formed the basis for this research” instead of “informed the basis for this research Line 497 – should be “its tasteless” instead of “it tasteless” Line 536-538 may be deleted from the text. Line 544 – “It will also serve a baseline information and guide to farmers...” to be replaced with “It will also	All the corrections as specified have been duly effected on the various lines as suggested and requested by the reviewer.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	provide baseline information and offer guidance to farmers...." Line 547 – “Waste” to be replaced by “wastage”	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	(i) The author(s) has/have tried their best to effectively characterize a few important Elite Plantain cultivars through organoleptic means for value addition and food security in Nigeria. It can serve as first-hand information for processors too and can be a ready source of information for farmers or even for a common man. The various varieties available in Nigeria and their uses are also highlighted by the author(s). (ii) It will be better if the title can be “Organoleptic and Horticultural characterization of Selected Elite cultivars of Plantain (<i>Musa paradisiaca</i> L) for value addition and food security in Nigeria ”.	The title have been recast as suggested. This is better. Thanks.