



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/BJAST/2298
Title of the Manuscript:	Proximate and Mineral Composition of a Non-Alcoholic Beverage Spiced With Aframomum melegueta Extract Produced from Sorghum bicolor Stem Sheath.

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments	
1. Authorship- ❖ A third author was introduced in this revised paper 2. Introduction- ❖ This section is bulky. ❖ Paragraphs 1-3 should be deleted as well as the last two sentences of paragraph four (4). ❖ The objective should constitute the last sentence of the last paragraph (see my modification in the revised paper). 3. Materials and methods ❖ The authors tried to effect most of the suggestions made by me in the original submission. ❖ However, it seems to me that the flow diagrams (figures 1 & 2) are not original to these authors and as such I do not see its relevance here. ❖ A new subtitle- Statistical analysis should be created as 2.9. The last two (2) sentences of 2.6 (now 2.8; Sensory	1. Authorship- ❖ The third author is one of my supervisors and played major role in the work. He was however not around when I did the initial write-up which is the first manuscript sent. He has actively participated in the revision of the manuscript. Hence, the inclusion of his name in the list of authors. 2. Introduction- ❖ This section is no more bulky. ❖ Paragraphs 1-3 have been deleted as well as the last two sentences of paragraph four (4). ❖ The objectives now constitute the last sentence of the last paragraph. 3. Materials and methods ❖ The flow diagrams (figures 1 & 2) have been removed but the process is however described in the text. ❖ A new subtitle- Statistical analysis has been created as 2.9. The last two (2) sentences of 2.6 (now 2.8; Sensory evaluation) has been moved to constitute part of 2.9. Methodology for the analyses of pH, TTA, proximate and mineral contents of poporo have been described. 4. Results and Discussion ❖ The issues raised in the original paper have been addressed. The raw data for the work was revisited and some re-calculation done. This is responsible for the variance in Table 3. 5. Reference Agarry <i>et al.</i> (2010)..... <i>International Research Journal of Microbiology</i> has been corrected.	



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

evaluation) should be moved to constitute the component of this of 2.9. Methodology for the analyses of pH, TTA, proximate and mineral content of poporo should be described. 4. Results and Discussion ❖ These vehemently refused to address the issues I raised in the original paper submission. ❖ None of the queries were addressed. I suggested that the authors should go through the observations I made and meticulously address those points. ❖ The data in Table 3 is obviously at variance with those of the initial submission. 5. Reference Agarry <i>et al.</i> (2010).....<i>International Research Journal of Microbiology</i>	
--	--