



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_22403
Title of the Manuscript:	An on Farm nutritive assessment of Milk from Fulani Herds in the Derived Savanna Zone of Nigeria
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 The manuscript deals with a very crucial aspect (food security). However it is so poorly written that the message is not conveyed. The language is too poor and authors do not seem to have any level of understanding of statistics. The introduction is merely a continuous writing without any research questions. Results poorly presented and discussion based merely on assumption. On these background the work could not be concluded. Overall, the manuscript is very poor.	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	Authors are expected to rewrite the manuscript from introduction to the conclusion. They are advised to acquaint themselves with basic statistical terminologies while rewriting the manuscript. The language also needs to be much improved. Abstract should be written to reflect the revision.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Siaka Diarra
Department, University & Country	Department of Animal Science, University of the South Pacific, Samoa