



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	The manuscript contained useful information on seed compositions of sheanut and cocoa. However, the manuscript has multiple flaws: 1- It looks like the authors conducted the experiment for one year (season) only. This type of experiments needs at least two-year data because of the changes in the yearly environmental factors, especially temperature and rainfall. These environmental factors can influence seed composition profile significantly. 2- Materials and Methods: This section should include details about which year the experiment was conducted, field conditions, soil properties, details about field management, and so on. None of these were indicated. 3- Weather data (temperatures and rainfall) should be included. 4- Experimental design and statistical analyses are not included (this section is crucial for the evaluation of similarities and differences in seed composition properties. If the authors are willing to address these components and conduct the experiment for another year, include proper analyses of the data, the author can re-submit their manuscript again for review. Publishing this manuscript as is, would lower the quality of the journal and loose high quality researchers to submit their work to the journal. I appreciate the opportunity, and please let me know if you have questions. My editings/remarks are indicated on the manuscript, and are attached in my email.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	My remarks/editing's indicated on the manuscript (pdf file).	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Yes. Please refer to the above comments (Materials and Methods, experimental design and statistical analyses).	
--	--	--

Reviewer Details:

<u>Name:</u>	Anonymous
<u>Department, University & Country</u>	Crop Genetics and Production Research Unit, USA