



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Chemical Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_ACSj_14678
Title of the Manuscript:	Analytical and Nutritional Evaluation of velvet tamarind (<i>Dialium guineense</i>) pulps
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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Revision in the text format (paragraph, justified format...) Stile – some number in italic Numbers after dot example 0.40% and 11.8% Values as 112.82mg/g or 112.82 mg.g ⁻¹ Space between lines (simple or 1.5) see Mineral analysis Phthalate formula - confused Reference number close or distant from parenthesis Tables – complete information mg/g etc. Reference – letter size different Reference – the name of the journal or book	DONE VALUES AS mg/g Done No confused formula DONE DONE DONE DONE
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The Conclusion should be explored a little more especially because the paper suggest a good nutrition to children, elderly and also to supply some deficiencies nutrition's.	ADJUSTED in the revised