



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 manner.</i>	



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>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Universidad de Sonora, Mexico