



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_11561
Title of the Manuscript:	Caffeine and phenolic compounds in <i>Cola nitida</i> (Vent.) Schott & Endl and <i>Garcinia kola</i> Heckel grown in Côte d'Ivoire
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	The article is technically sound. However, there is need to add more health issues associated with caffeine consumption in the discussion. The relationship of caffeine and hypertension and other issues. Also the anti-nutrient content of the kola nuts should be reflected as well as ways of minimizing its effect should be discussed.	In this first study known as controls, the contents of anti-nutriments were not evaluated. It was firstly to reveal the presence of certain groups of major compounds and greater nutritional interest and then to evaluate their contribution in term of nutriment for the human health.
Minor REVISION comments	Check the spellings and grammar as I highlighted some for correction	
Optional/General comments	Good work	