



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_8464
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of fermentation on the proximate, mineral and antinutritional composition of slimy kola (<i>Cola verticillata</i>) husk and white shell.
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	Reviewer's report on Manuscript title: Effect of fermentation on the proximate, mineral and antinutritional composition of slimy kola (<i>Cola verticillata</i>) husk and white shell (Manuscript number: 2013_BJAST_8464) The above manuscript This study evaluates the proximate, mineral and antinutritional composition of slimy kolanut (<i>Cola verticillata</i>) husk and white shell. The authors concluded that the presence of essential nutrients, minerals and reduction of antinutrients in the samples are an indication that it can be used in the production or fortification of animal feeds. There are minor/major points that need to be addressed (Some changes/modifications are indicated in bold) Abstract L11-L12: Suggested modification: - Other minerals determined were sodium, phosphorus, iron and zinc. Introduction L22: Please change:- 'tropical rainforest of Africa countries (Ndagi <i>et al.</i>, 2012)' to 'tropical rainforest of African countries (Ndagi <i>et al.</i>, 2012)'	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	L34: Please indicate year in the citation Hamaz and Adeola (xxxx). Which is correct? Hamaz or Hamzat? Compare with L287. L35: Please change:- 'used to formulate feed for poultry birds' to 'used to formulate feed for poultry' L37: Please change: 'out by Arotupin <i>et al.</i>, 2012 on microorganisms', to 'out by Arotupin <i>et al.</i> (2012) on microorganisms', L46-L50: Suggested modification:- 'Agricultural waste can be used to provide potential cleaning adsorbent for the environment. An example is activated carbon which appears to be of interest from the point of view of large scale application which uses simple technology via subjecting the parent material to either chemical or thermal process that removes non-carbon atoms from the material, leading to the development of internal porosity and increased surface area (Adeyi, 2010)'. L55: Please change '(Subramaniam, 2012)'. to '(Subramaniam and Vimala, 2012)'. (Please refer to L329) Results L127-L128: Please change:- 'Solid state fermented is observed from the result presented to increase sodium content of the white shell sample than liquid state	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	fermentation’ to ‘Increase sodium content of the white shell sample is observed in the solid state than in the liquid state fermentation’ L135: Please change: ‘Both liquid and solid state fermentation reduced phytate (mg/g), tannin (mg/g) and cyanide (mg/g)’ to ‘Both liquid and solid state fermentation had reduced phytate (mg/g), tannin (mg/g) and cyanide (mg/g)’ Tables: Please indicate values along the same column that are significantly ($P<0.05$) different and indicate so with appropriate superscripts. The superscripts should be deleted in the text. Discussion L173-L174: Please change:- ‘the quality of food which helps to know what processing operation and storage method to employ, this is because it affects the progress of chemical’ to ‘the quality of food which helps food processing companies to know what processing operation and storage method to be employed; this is because moisture content affects the progress of chemical’ L176: Please change:- ‘unfermented (control) samples probably’ to ‘unfermented (control) samples; this is probably’ L177: Suggested change: ‘imbibition (L. im-	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<i>bibo</i>, to drink in), defined in the' to 'imbibition (L. <i>im-bibo</i>, to drink in). Imbibition is defined in the' L183: Please change: '(Akindahunsi <i>et al.</i>, 1999) also, fat content' to '(Akindahunsi <i>et al.</i>, 1999), also fat content' L184: Please change: 'might have being washed into' to 'might have been washed into' L188: Please correct: 'process which is in concordance with the report of Kuforiji, 2006.' to 'process, this is in concordance with the report of Kuforiji, (2006).' L189: Please change: 'obtained by Adeyi, 2010 whom studied' to 'obtained by Adeyi (2010) who studied' L1188-L190: Although the ash content your samples are at variance with that of Adeyi (2010), please indicate <i>whether</i> they are statistically different. L205: Please correct: 'Mastika <i>et al.</i>, 2011 reported' to 'Mastika <i>et al</i> (2011) reported' L215: Please change: 'to It., report has shown' to 'to it. Report has shown' Conclusion L235-L244: Please re-write the conclusion to	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	convey the basic facts of your research. Delete full sentences from L237- L242. Thus the conclusion may read: ‘The nutritional composition of the sample increased and the antinutritional composition reduced considerably. The effect of fermentation was positive on the samples especially liquid state fermentation as compared to solid state fermentation. Kolanut husk and white shell could be used to substitute some quantity of grains/cereals used for the production of animal feed or its formulation, and also could be used to fortify animal feed to increase its nutritional quality or value’. References L287: Which is correct? Hamzat or Hamaz? Compare L34 in text.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	There are minor corrections that need to be addressed	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The present work is well researched and well written	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pius M. Udia
Department, University & Country	Department of Pharmacology, College of Medical Sciences, University of Calabar, Nigeria