



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) |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| Compulsory 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"> 1. <i>It lacks reproducibility. The authors do not declare the way samples were acquired, nor number or replicates.</i> 2. <i>Methodology employed is quite ambiguous and lacks the minimum standards of reporting methodology.</i> 3. <i>No statistical considerations are made about result figures.</i> 4. <i>Results are not presented in a scientific way, and the manuscript has not text only tables and figures.</i> 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> 6. <i>Methods and techniques used for analysis have serious deficiencies as how these should be reported in a proper scientific</i> | <p>Corrections were effected</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Is not true, each of the table has its own title.</p> <p>How?</p> |



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | <p><i>matter.</i></p> <p>7. <i>The manuscript has serious language problems and in some parts is difficult to under stain.</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> | |
| <u>Minor</u> REVISION comments | | |
| <u>Optional/General</u> comments | | |