



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_31159
Title of the Manuscript:	Proximate composition and nutritional analysis of seeds and testas of <i>Dacryodes edulis</i> and <i>Garcinia kola</i>
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 (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	The current manuscript deals with assessment of <i>Dacryodes edulis</i> and <i>Garcinia kola</i> seeds and testa as a nutritional source. The study findings are interesting and the authors have tried to look at various parameters. The manuscript has following issues which have to be rectified for further consideration. 1) The authors have cited literature papers supporting the general properties of the indicated plants. However, the authors have missed some important literature papers that are discussing the properties of their seeds. For instance, http://www.bioline.org.br/request?nd09083 discussed the different toxicants and nutrients present in the African pear seeds. So, authors should cite the proper literature papers discussing the properties of seeds and testas in their introduction, discussion to highlight their findings comparing to available literature. 2) In methods, the authors have mentioned that the seeds were stored at room temperature. But, the measurement for moisture, and other parameters may vary due to storage conditions. Plz comment on this. 3) All the methods were not described. Though the authors have cited the papers/books, the protocols are not accessible to the reads in a easy way. So, I request the authors to add the details of each method in brief	Thank you. The suggested journal is cited in this work. Thanks for the suggestion. They were stored at 4°C and not 25°C (room temperature). The only procedure not described briefly were those of the vitamins and minerals because these are procedures that cannot really be shortened so much. I have added a conversion units for clarity and reproducibility.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	and also mention in detail the way the results were expressed /showed in the manuscript. For instance, AOAC method for measuring mineral elements is not accessible. Also, we can see the difference in the units represented for different Vitamins. So, these issues should be clearly described in the methods in order to facilitate others can reproduce the same. 4) Some references are very old and not accessible now. Some of them are 1944/1946/AOAC-1995/2002 are not readily available to the readers. So, I suggest the authors to cite the ones which they really followed for their study or the recent papers that were readily available to community and describe each of the methods in brief. 5) References-14, 21 & 22 doesn't have page numbers. Please insert the page numbers to follow. 6) In the statistical analysis, the authors should mention about the group that served for comparing. In the table footnotes, it should be indicated that the symbols such as a, b.. etc (superscript) described and in comparison to which group the values are significant. 7) The manuscript needs grammatical corrections.	We have replaced these references with similar ones. Interestingly, AOAC 1990 is freely available online and we have cited the pages appropriately. Done. Seed for seed and testa for testa. We have gone through the work all over again to correct the grammatical flaws.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		I want to say thank you for your keen and constructive review of this paper. We hope we have addressed all the comment you raised. Thank you