



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_8555
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE NUTRITIONAL QUALITIES OF SEEDS OF SHEANUT (<i>Vitellaria paradoxa</i>) AND COCOA (<i>Theobroma cacao</i>)
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 <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	In the materials and methods, i don't know if the author used the shea nut seed, or fruit. The author should clear that. Also, a lot of statement needs reference, like "The anti-nutritional nature of phytic acid lies in its ability to chelate certain important minerals such as calcium, magnesium, iron and zinc in humans and animals, forming mineral-phytic acid complexes." The author should go through the manuscript and put necessary reference to some statement of facts. References: - A lot of references are listed but not cited. E.g Bernardini 1973 Cocks and Rede 1973 Deman 1992 Herbant 1992 Eka 1980, James 1995, Meyer 1987, Rossel 1991 Reiffel 2006 The Goldbook 1997 The author should either remove them or cite them.	It was the shea nut seed that was used for the study and this was stated in the manuscript. Necessary reference has been put in place; those uncited references have also been removed.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	I think the author need to make the reader understand why some results are like that especially the minerals and he/she should stop explaining the functions of each minerals. Also, some of the compared references are too old. The author should get recent references and used for the comparism.	The reason for the observed low mineral contents was stated in the manuscript and necessary corrections have been made.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	It is an original work and good for publication after all the corrections.	