



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	2014_AIR_12059
Title of the Manuscript:	DETERMINATION OF THE NUTRITIVE VALUES OF <i>Pelophylax esculentus</i> (EDIBLE FROG) FOUND IN HANYAN GWARI, MINNA NIGER STATE, 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	It's an interesting investigation, but the results and discussion were not well demonstrated. Specifically, (1) The title was not consistent with the results the authors showed (2) Research purpose was not properly narrated (3) The analysis material was not properly prepared, the nutrition facts of the dried samples cannot represent the raw meat (4) Some mistakes in Tables should be corrected, Such as the unit is lost in Table 1, etc (5) Page 2, line 61 "50 g of ground seed sample", did the authors use the analysis method of seed sample to perform the meat sample?	Corrections/suggestions were noted and effected
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	More efforts should be paid to improve the quality of the manuscript.	