



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Advances in Research</a>
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript has serious deficiencies from the scientific standpoint. In order to sustain my opinion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. <i>It lacks reproducibility. The authors do not declare the way samples were acquired, nor number or replicates.</i></li><li>2. <i>Methodology employed is quite ambiguous and lacks the minimum standards of reporting methodology.</i></li><li>3. <i>No statistical considerations are made about result figures.</i></li><li>4. <i>Results are not presented in a scientific way, and the manuscript has not text only tables and figures.</i></li><li>5. <i>Authors do not have a clear idea of how results have to be analyzed. In some of the techniques reported they referred to "seeds" and they are analyzing frog tissues.</i></li><li>6. <i>Methods and techniques used for analysis have serious deficiencies as how these should be reported in a proper scientific matter.</i></li></ol>	<p>Corrections were effected</p>



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>7. <i>The manuscript has serious language problems and in some parts is difficult to understain.</i></p> <p>Manuscripts such as this can be return to authors, previous to send them to reviewers, at least to be presented in a minimum acceptable way.</p>	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments		
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		