



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART A:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/BJAST/1572
Title of the Manuscript:	<i>DETERMINATION OF MINERAL COMPOSITION, ANTI-MICROBIAL ACTIVITY AND ANTI-NUTRIENT SCREENING OF Cleome gynandra (CAT'S WHISKERS).</i>
Manuscript received on (Date)	
Review comment submitted (Date)	



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART B: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part and write here 'Corrected'/ if not agreed, give suitable justifications)
General comment:	The manuscript (MS)presented some useful information about the mineral composition, anti-microbial activity and anti-nutrient screening of <i>Cleome gynandra</i>, however, the result about the mineral composition is hardly to understand. For example, the MS claims only presence of Ca, Fe, Mg and Na, but absence of Cu, Mn, Zn in the leaf and root of <i>Cleome gynandra</i>. Cu, Mn and Zn are the minerals necessary to known plant species, and logically they should be present, more or less in any known plants. For instance, the <i>Cleome gynandra</i> is rich of PPOs which are Cu²⁺-containing enzymes. Secondly, the way of “Results” presenting is hardly seen in the scientific journals. Therefore, the ms is not suggested to be accepted for publishing in BJASt.	Not agreed with b/c not all minerals are found in all plants. More so, it's possible Cu and Zn are found in the plant but in such quantities that the machine used could not detect them. So we are confirming that the equipment we used could not detect any Cu and Zn
Specific comments:	P8 Line 191: hard to understand what in (). Lack one space between number and unit, such as P5 Line 101, 105, 111, 117, 119 ...	Corrected
Title and abstract	OK	
Introduction	OK	
Review of literature (Heading may differ in the case of review paper)	OK	
Materials & methods (Heading may differ in the case of review paper)	Poor	
Results & discussion (Heading may differ in the case of review paper)	The results were poorly presented, and in particular hard to believe. The discussion didn't address the key issues such as why absence of Cu, Mn and Zn	The aim and objectives of the MS was not to find out whether or not mineral elements are found in the plant.
Conclusion	Based on disputable results	
References	OK	