**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 *Cola nitida* (Vent.) Schott & Endl and *Garcinia kola* 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 | This article seems interesting. The aim of the study is clear. The manuscript is within the scope of the journal. The language is quite acceptable.<br>The method is good enough to be published in BJAST after corrections. | |
| **Minor** REVISION comments | Abstract: dot in the end of last sentence<br>Folin-Ciocalteau<br>Table 1. correct latin names in italic<br>Page 2. Line 78. Dot<br>Page 3. Line 133: Japan<br>Page 3. Line 133 and 134: Shimadzu<br>Standardize references: some present and before last author; some present "" for title; correct reduced journal's names,<br>ref#17 July 2013 | |
| **Optional/General** comments | The authors have to correct appropriately this manuscript. | |

*Note: Anonymous Reviewer*