



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	<p>The manuscript subject is interesting and is worthy publishing but there are some major aspects that must be revised by the authors, such as a better description of the sample and sampling procedures, a better description of the methods used for proximate analysis as well as the revision of the nutrient nomenclature. All these aspects are indicated on the pdf file, which I am sending back .</p> <p>Other than that, analysis of phytochemical compounds is inappropriate for animal tissue. Determination of such compounds with the methodology usually applied for plant tissues is totally unappropriated. Please, see comments on the original pdf file.</p> <p>In the discussion section, authors should pay attention to the relationship of high Na content and non-communicable diseases, as they correlate Na content with diabetes instead of cardiac diseases.</p> <p>The discussion about the nutritional value of the dried "meat" product should be revised because the aim of such study is to evaluate the offer of another food item to a certain diet. This food item will not, ever, contribute to the total DRI of any macro or micro nutrient. So, revise accordingly.</p> <p>Although the authors evaluated several functional properties, they do not discuss these properties at</p>	Corrections/observations were noted and effected



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>all.</p> <p>It is also advisable that the authors include some information about the traditional consumption of this species by the regional/traditional communities in the introduction.</p> <p>Please, see other comments and suggestions on the original file.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>Plagiarism issue- No, but the authors should have consulted and quoted the article which is quite similar:</p> <p>Nutritive Potentials of Male and Female Edible Frog (Pelophylax esculentus) II: Selected Trace Elements and Functional Properties</p> <p>G.O. Oyeleke¹, M.A. Salam¹ and R.O. Adetoro IOSR Journal of Environmental Science, Toxicology and Food Technology Volume 1, Issue 4 (Sep-Oct. 2012), PP 29-31</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		