



## SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

### PART 1:

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

### PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>Even when the authors tried to improve the document in relation to the previous one, I find serious deficiencies in the document to be considered for publication. I will draw your attention to some of these deficiencies.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The authors do not describe properly the sample used in this study. Please read the description of the sample. This single aspect will be enough reason to reject the paper, since an inadequate description of the sample makes it impossible to reproduce the experiment, any experiment.</li> <li>2. Some of the methodology used is not referred properly. There are serious doubts about the knowledge of the authors or expertise in the methodology used. Example, in the amino acid analysis they describe 30 grams!!!! of defatted sample to be hydrolyzed with 7.0 mL of HCl (Hydrochloric acid), fundamental part in the analysis of amino acids. This is impossible since the technique correctly describes 1.0 mg / mL of HCl for a proper sample digestion. A mistake or lack of knowledge?</li> <li>3. Some techniques and methods used are still deficient in terms of the way they are reported..</li> <li>4. Most important in the section of Results, the authors simply present tables without any text description. Simply unacceptable.</li> <li>5. The grammatical presentation of the manuscript is highly incorrect for a publication in a scientific journal. Example, last paragraph in the section they describe as Discussion of Results.</li> <li>6. The authors do not respond to the original observation made in my first evaluation. Please see the format provided to give response and explanation. then only write correction provided.</li> </ol> <p>I understand the authors really tried to provide a response to the evaluators' remarks from the first evaluation, I understand that the subject of the paper in the use of <i>P. scutentata</i> may be of importance for the people in that country. However, I also believed that scientific publication must go through a very rigorous reviewing process. I am very sorry but the manuscript presents serious deficiencies.</p>	<p>How? Please check very well</p> <p>noted</p> <p>In what way?</p> <p>I think the title of each table is given</p>