SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
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	**Full length**

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 introduction has no link with the title of the article.** ■ **Lines 28 to 33 should be expunged from the introduction.** ■ **I will recommend that the introduction be rewritten and to focus on the topic and relevance of the study.** ■ **State clearly how you prepared the cocnut husk,** Cocoa pod husk and *Gmelina* tree shavings **ash.** ■ **You cannot determine microbial load without knowing the weight of the sample making dilution of the sample. Please repeat this aspect under methods.**	
Minor REVISION comments	-- Line 47 MATERIAL should be MATERIALS. -- Lines 51 and 52--- Cocoa pod husk and *Gmelina* tree shavings were purchased. -- Microbial analysis of what? Please state. -- Microorganisms are needed for fermentation to take place. Which organisms did you use or if spontaneous, did you find out the organisms involved in the fermentation? -- Proximate composition, antinutrient contents and sensory evaluation should be done on the samples before fermentation. -- Lines 152 to 156- please indicate the actual numbers for the microbial loads per gram of the samples. -- Lines 157 to 170 – There is no way you would have known the microbial types occurrence in the samples from the beginning because this was not stated in the methods. -- Discussion is too long. It contains a lot of irrelevant materials. It should be reduced.	
Optional/General comments	The authors left out very important aspects of this research in the manuscript.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Lennox, Josiah Asime***
Department, University & Country	***Department of Microbiology, University of Calabar, Calabar, Nigeria***