



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJGMB_52342
Title of the Manuscript:	Biochemical Changes Associated with Consumption of Garri Processed by Traditional and Instant Mechanical Methods in Wistar Rats
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	<p>I suggest that the title of the work be reviewed .Suggested titles are :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Biochemical Changes Associated with Consumption (by Rats) of "Garri" Processed by Traditional and Instant Mechanical Methods. (2) Effect of Consumption of Traditionally Processed and Instant Mechanically Processed "Garri" on some Biochemical Parameters in Wistar Rats. (3) Comparative Effects of Traditionally Processed and Instant Mechanically Processed "Garri" on some Biochemical Parameters in Wistar Rats. <p>Abstract should be rewritten. Abstract lacks a proper conclusion. Abstract should address how the renal and liver function indices were affected in garri –fed rats when compared with the control diet.</p> <p>There should be a table indicating Proximate Composition and Cyanide Contents of the Experimental Diets. The findings of the research are not addressed in the "Results" section. Only tables are drawn. Statements highlighting alterations in the parameters assayed should have been made in the Results section. Authors should concentrate on discussing the findings of the research, rather than giving a lot of general information.</p> <p>Conclusion and Recommendation section should be rewritten. The References section should be worked on, after removal of unnecessary details from the Discussion section.</p>	The manuscript has been modified considering the reviewer comments.
Minor REVISION comments	Authors should remove words and sentences highlighted in red. Use words and sentences highlighted in green.	
Optional/General comments	Authors should address issues or items highlighted in blue.	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	None