



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	Authors provide very general comparison analysis of nutritional information for seeds of sheanut and cocoa. Need more info for fatty acids composition, amino acids breakdown, and sugars content. There is not enough information about chemicals/analytical equipment (model, name and location of manufacture) used for analyses. Results have to reported in tables with statistical analysis. Almost references used in this manuscript putty old – 20-35 years old. Interesting data for anti-nutrients content	The name and model of all equipment used for analyses was stated in the manuscript. The author cannot ascertain the state and country of manufacture of the used equipment. All other corrections have been made in the manuscript as suggested by the reviewer.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		