SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Food Science Journal**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AFSJ_55169**
Title of the Manuscript:	**PRODUCTION OF MALT-BASED SUGAR SYRUP FROM ENZYMATIC HYDROLYSIS OF MALTED SORGHUM AND MILLET GRAINS.**
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	**The Abstract is the first impression that should be handled carefully.** Some parts of the abstract need to be rewritten: The 1st statement that may be changed is: … than millet grains: 76.6%, 85.67%, 27 ^{O}L and 18.47% respectively. Consider: … than millet grains whose corresponding values were 76.6 %, 85.67 %, 27 ^{O}L and 18.47 % respectively. The statement "Mashing temperature and pH optima results for amylase activity were 60-70^{0}C in sorghum, 40-45^{0}C in millet and pH 6-7 in sorghum and millet respectively" is unclear. **pH, 6-7 is a range and does not refer to either sorghum or millet; there seems to be an omission.** Perhaps it may be much better if a restatement such as: The mashing temperature ranges and pH optima for the enzymes in sorghum and millet were 60-70^{0}C and x (for the pH) and 40-45^{0}C and y (for the pH) respectively. The next statement to be changed or reconstructed is: "Results obtained on the analysis of the malt syrup samples (sorghum and millet) were (%): moisture (12.35, 13.46), ash (0.02, 0.04), pH (4.5, 5.0), total solids (82.20, 80.1), Dextrose equivalent (85, 81) and reducing sugar (70.30, 65.45) respectively". Perhaps it may be much better if a restatement such as: The results obtained for sorghum after the analysis of the malt syrup samples showed that the moisture content, ash content, total solids, dextrose equivalent, and reducing sugars expressed as percentage were 12.35, 0.02, 82.20, 85 and 70.30 respectively. The corresponding values for millet were 13.46, 0.04, 80.1, 81 and 65.45 respectively. The pH recorded for sorghum and millet were 4.5 and 5.0 respectively. **pH should not be a part of the quantification in percentage.** **Explain the statement: "**A blank was prepared of the unfiltered malt infusion and 2% buffered starch solution"-under the subheading **Determination of Diastatic power**. …'it was made up to the mark at that flask and diluted to mark at 20^{0}C'. This may be changed to "it was diluted at 20 ^{o}C by making up to the 250 ml mark"- **under the subheading, 'Determination of reducing sugar content'** **Explain …** the percentage reducing sugar in the sample *'as is' specifically, what is 'as is'?* Titere in your equation is not clear; do you mean ***titre?*** Specify in the text the model and manufacturer of the spectrophotometer and centrifuge employed. Indicate the **calibration curve used in the determination of the concentration of glucose.** Varying concentrations of glucoamylase, 0.05 %, 0.01 %, and 0.15 % (dry weight basis of the mash: Do you mean the mass of a dry amount of sample taken divide by the **total mass of the stock times 100? Please, explain-under subsection 2.9.2.** **Give the full names of DNS and explain** DWB at the 1st mention for the general public. Explain… (DWB of the mash) was added and incubated for 36 hours (with constant shaking) until the desired DE… 36 hours is > a day: **with what did you shake?** **"Table 2" should be Table 3**. Fig. 1 should be re-plotted using Excel so as to be consistent in structure with other figures. To extrapolate, Fig 1 should show either linear or nonlinear relationship between dependent or independent variables. There is always an equation for such. **If the phrase "external glucoamylase" at the introductory section** means microbial source of the enzyme, give the microbial source in support of your specific objective and conclusion. **The keywords should include alpha amylase and beta amylase.**	

SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	**The paper may be published if the errors identified are corrected;** the table of values may be redesigned according to SDI specification on demand with template given by SD editorial staff.	
Optional/General comments	Proof-reading of a manuscript by author (s) does not necessarily produce a perfect manuscript, but failure to do so may retain too many errors as observed in this manuscript. The author (s) is/are advised to read the manuscript before submission so as to identify significant number of errors to be corrected. While suggestions have been made and marked in red on the manuscript, the author (s) may wish to seek an expert in English Language to correctly state the statements that should replace the suggestions (excluding scientific terms) made herein. It is either British or American (USA) spelling; SDI prefers British. There must be a change! Seek the standard abbreviations of journals cited and report as such as required by SDI.	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Udema Iloh Ikechukwu***
Department, University & Country	***Nigeria***