



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Chemical Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_ACSj_14678
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutritional composition of velvet tamarind (<i>Dialium guineense</i>) pulps.
Type of the Article	Research 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		
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>My individual comments are listed below.</p> <p>Language is not acceptable. It must be corrected by a native speaker in English.</p> <p>This paper is rather a report on the chemical composition of one food sample.</p> <p>P. 2 – Where is an aim of this research?</p> <p>All results must be reported as mean value \pmSD.</p> <p>What is a reason for determination of water soluble and sulphated ash?</p> <p>P. 4 1. 101 – Centrifugation must be characterized by “x g” instead of “rpm”.</p> <p>Table 1 & 2 – Where are the units?</p> <p>There is no description of cyanide determination.</p> <p>References are prepared in a chaotic way.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Poland