



SDI Review Form 1.6

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.

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	This manuscript has some major criticisms. The results in both table are presented as means but the standard error is missing. The standard error could help the reader to evaluate the results of the statistical analysis which in this manuscript gives origin to some doubts. The reviewer is wondering if the differences observed by the authors are really significant. The letter of significance in both table 1 and 2 are sometimes not clear. For some parameters one decimal number is sufficient (for example moisture, Mg content, etc.) because the error provided by the analytical procedure is much higher than the second or third decimal presented by the authors. The specific numbers of the different AOAC methods used for the study have to be reported.	The standard error has been included. The decimal places has been corrected uniformly. Only one edition of AOAC method was used for the various analysis
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Some minor criticisms: Line 134: explain the meaning of 0.014 in the formula. Line 175: explain the meaning of 0.09 in the formula. Line 182-191: does the determination has been carried out on the original juice? No dilution has been performed? Line 187-188: this sentence should be delete because is probably related only to the authors equipment. Several units of measurements are not correctly reported throughout the manuscript. Line 13 and following: min instead of mins. Line 68 and following: h instead of hrs. Line 139 and following: °C instead of °c. Line 163 and 164: pH. Line 166: ml instead of mls. Line 172: 0.1M instead of 0.1m; Line 30: proximate composition instead of proximate. Line 33: ... and is the fifth... Line 37: plains of the United...	Line 134, 175, 182-191 and 187-188 have been deleted. Units of measurements have been correctly reported in the manuscript. Line 13: mins, line 68: h, line 139: °c, Line 163 and 164: pH. Line 166: ml. Line 172 has been deleted, Line 30: proximate composition, Line 33: ... and is the fifth..., Line 37: plains of the United...



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 53: sugars Line 267: is presented The list of references is inaccurate in several items. For example: page number is missing at line 430 and 438; the Journal name is missing at line 430; year is missing at line 437; the name of the Journal is not fully reported at line 415-416 and 440-441; Chemists instead of Chemist at line 425; the initial of the name Okpara is missing at line 428; add space at line 411, 419 and 423; full stop is missing at line 418, 427, 456, 458; line 409 <i>danielli</i> not clear.	Line 53: sugars, Line 267: is presented have been corrected References on the following lines: 430,437, 438, 515-416, 440-441, 425,428, 411, 419, 423, 418,427,456,458, 409 have been corrected.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This manuscript should be published after major revisions.	This manuscript should be published after major revisions.