

Editor's Comment:

I have gone through all the stages for evaluating the manuscript under review and my comments are as follows:

1. Three reviewers have reviewed the manuscript, out of which only two have made scientifically sound comments on the manuscript and I do agree with their comments.

None of the reviewers rejected the manuscript, but authors have not complied fully with the instructions of the reviewers and some other points needs to be addressed.

I hereby recommend that the **manuscript “Comparative proximate, antioxidant vitamins and mineral composition of leaves of four selected tropical nutritional plants namely: Ocimum gratissimum, Piper guineense, Gongronema latifolium and Vernonia amygdalina.” SHOULD NOT BE ACCEPTED** for publication in European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety until below mentioned corrections are made by the authors.

1. The manuscript is poorly written in terms of grammar. The author needs to remove these grammatical errors present throughout the manuscript. It would be better to take help of some English Language grammar expert.

2. As suggested by one of the reviewer, there is no such word as 'antioxidant vitamin'. However, the authors had given baseless justification for keeping this in the title of the manuscript. As per my view, the reviewer is right as it confuses the readers, Secondly, the authors have not performed any analysis for testing or comparing the antioxidant activity of the test leaves. So, remove the word antioxidant from title as well as the main body of the manuscript.

3. The authors had not mentioned details of the instruments used in the study.

4. Most important point is that, no details of statistical analysis are mentioned in the methodology part. If no statistical analysis is performed, then how the authors are claiming value for a particular parameter in one type of leaves is different from the other type of leaves? There is no meaning of study without scientific and statistical analysis.

5. Discussion part should always include what you get and what were the results of similar work conducted in the past by other workers. How your work is similar or different from that and what could be the possible reasons for this. All this information is missing in the discussion part.

6. Authors have not performed any analysis for anti-oxidative, anti-diabetic, anti-arthritic or such other effects of the leaves. Just on the basis of compositional analysis, authors cannot recommend these leaves in diet or for preparation of medicines. The whole conclusion part should be written on the basis of results obtained and not on the basis of probable therapeutic effects of these macro and micro constituents.

Editor's Details:

Dr. Manvesh Kumar Sihag

Assistant Professor, Dairy Chemistry Department, Mansinhbhai Institute of Dairy & Food Technology (MIDFT), Dudhsagar Dairy Campus Mehsana, Gujarat, India