



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJAST_16577
Title of the Manuscript:	Proximate contents of Bambara Groundnut Vigna subterranean (L.) Verdc) grown in Madobi, Kano state-Nigeria
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The amount of research work done in this paper is very little. In the Materials and methods section it's better if the author can explain a brief description about the proximate analysis of different constituents.	- Full stop on the title was removed - The word verdc is correct, is a scientific word indicating group a family. - AOAC METHODS are well documented standard procedures, in science is not appropriate to re-report standard procedure, except with certain modification(s).
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Typos, spellings and formatting suggestions are given as comments in the Manuscript itself.	Line 7: is replaced by was Line 15: maddobicould = maddobi could Line 31 and 42: the words were separated see revised article
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Discussion part is very poor.	Discussion was recast see revised article