



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_15889
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF <i>Aspergillus niger</i> AND <i>Trichoderma viride</i> ON THE NUTRITIONAL COMPOSITION OF ALKALI PRETREATED GROUNDNUT HUSK.
Type of the 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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. Line 41: It is essential to state clearly the objective of study at the end of the introduction. 2. Line 42: Suggest to list out all the materials, reagents and instruments used in the study under a section: reagents and instrument (grade, brand name, country of origin) 3. Line 44 -46: Briefly describe the venue where author obtained both microorganism as well the process of pure strain isolation for <i>A. niger</i> and <i>T. viride</i> from the different sources mentioned. 4. Line 65: Suggest to include the information of control used. 5. Line 71-76: Suggest to list the unit of measurement for all the assay (you should do so in order to calculate SE), lower limit of detection and intra/inter assay coefficient of variation (CV) data for each assay to ensure the precision of result. 6. Line 85: Lack of figure title and legend to explain the figures. Must include any symbol within the figure (on top of each bar) to indicate the statistical significance between the groups. 7. Line 98: Table numbering is incorrect. Should be table 1, 2, 3. Where is table 3.2? 8. Table 3.1: I doubted the statistical analysis performed on the data in this table. For example, in ash parameter, the value in GH group (2.53%) was significantly different from the value in cGH and cGH <i>T. viride</i> groups	Corrected. Reagents used have been listed without origin as the reagent bottles have been discarded. Some of the instrument only have numbers on them or model. Done Done. It's not necessary, since this is method not result. Done



SDI Review Form 1.6

	(2.47 & 2.76%). However, it was not significantly different when compared to cGH A. niger group (1.35%) which has a much smaller value compared to both cGH and cGH T. viride groups. In fat parameter, I don't think there is any significant difference between cGH (2.11%) & cGH T viride groups (2.13%). For protein parameter, there should be statistical significant difference between cGH A niger (9.37%) and GH & cGH (4.87%) groups. Please clarify all these doubts. 9. Any significant difference among the different groups of GH for each type of amino acid listed in table 3.5? 10. Line 127-128: Before making this claim, author should perform a correlation analysis and test for its significance. 11. Line 131-132: Should include a citation in order to support the speculation made by the author. 12. Discussion section: Author should discuss also the reason behind other non-significant findings of the parameters tested in different GH groups. More references/ similar type of published studies should be used to compare/discuss the current findings to determine their result validity. Author should also include the limitations of their study before coming to the conclusion.	Noted It's a mistake, it has been corrected. Statistical analysis was not done for this table because the assay was carried out once. Correlation Chart of Lignin and Cellulose is shown as Appendix. Iyayi and Aderolu, 2004 was cited to support this point. Noted.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		