



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_10223
Title of the Manuscript:	Chemical and Anti-nutritional Composition of Cola acuminata Varieties
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	In discussion you mention only about beneficial effects of polyphenols, but designated those as anti-nutrients? What about statistical analysis? What about significance between verified parameters among two nuts. In what way your work is different from former works, already this type of works are carried out previously by Atanda et al (2011), Ajai et al (2012) and Odebunmi et al (2009).	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	You have to mention about planting conditions and about at what season you are collected seeds. For the analysis you are using dry powder but in method you mention that it is stored at 4⁰C. what the use is?	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The formats in the references are inconsistent. Please check.	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer