



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_30168
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of Fermentation on Proximate and Antinutrient Content of Ash Neutralized Roselle (Hibiscus sabdariffa L.) Calyces from Kwara and Ondo States, 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	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	Abstract - Two sentences in line 4 and 5 should be joined thus: A total of 8 organisms were isolated during fermentation, which included four (4) bacteria, one (1) yeast, and three (3) moulds. - Organisms should not be mixed-up. The sentence should read: They included(bacteria), ...(yeast), ...(moulds). - If you write; varies or increased or reduced significantly, at what significant level (α-level)? What percentage increase or decrease; 10%, 80% or 200%? - Avoid key words already in the title. Introduction - Not well written. Need for improvement - Problem not well identified. - Objectives of the study were not stated. Need to state objectives and significance of the study clearly. - Information is not flowing (mixed up). - Some information supposed to be in materials and methods is placed (See paragraph 4) Materials and methods Well written Results and discussion Results - Well-presented but should be written in reported speech.	All corrections effected



SDI Review Form 1.6

	2. No need to replicate results already in tables. 3. Need to provide SEM and P-values in the table of results to facilitate comparisons with α-values ($\alpha=0.05$). Discussion of results 1. Results well discussed 2. Some results are unnecessarily replicated during the discussion. 3. I suggest discussing results as they are presented to avoid undue repetition. References 1. Need to ensure that all references in the list are all in the text. Some references in the list are not well written. Refer to the first reference in the list where you started with small cap (unicef?; united nations)	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Need to improve writing skills by referring to articles in international refereed journals.	