



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_50218
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE PROXIMATE, ANTIOXIDANT VITAMINS AND MINERAL COMPOSITION OF FOUR SELECTED TROPICAL NUTRITIONAL/ MEDICINAL PLANTS NAMELY: Ocimum gratissimum, Piper guineense, Gongronema latifolium and Vernonia amygdalina.
Type of the Article	Original 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/journal/30/editorial-policy>)



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	<p>The reviewer found the method to be brief with direct citation to reference provided. Normally authors expected to provide more information rather than done here especially if any modifications done or for example more than one type of vitamin E is known to be present in nature. Readers not expected to be troubled to search for method to understand the journal when published. If so readership of your article will not be aplenty.</p> <p>Reviewer also cannot accept the results given without the exact values in text other than merely figuratively given. Values of your results important for readers to compare with their work and perform citation. Also expected you to also compare your values with other journals with similar work here if any.</p> <p><i>Comments on the manuscript.</i> Title Abstract Keywords</p> <p>Line 56 “plethora of vegetable”</p> <p>Line 61 “Rule of thumb in naming genus and species Line 101 Location coordinates Line 112 Extract in Tween 80 Section 2.2.2 and 2.2.4 As in first reviewers comment above Section 3.1 (Proximate analysis) Inclusion of values in the narrative (Reviewers comment no.2 above) Section 3.1 Inclusion of Tables</p> <p>Use of “crude” for proteins and fats Un-italicized Botanical names Figure 1 3.3 Minerals. Insertion of values in the text Fig 3: % composition Line 279 “Blind review”</p>	<p>In the Journal's instruction to Authors, Authors are encouraged to simply reference “already published methods”. “Only significant modification of published methods should be described in details”. Methods used in this study are readily accessible and were used as in references.</p> <p>Exact individual values can be discerned from the Figures. It is the thinking of the Authors that relisting of the individual values for all four plants in the narrative will make it unwieldy and cluttered. Inclusion in the abstract is understandable as readers with access to only abstracts will not have the benefit of the figures.</p> <p>Uniform font size adopted and title modified as suggested Values inserted as suggested. Up to 8 keywords allowed. Authors think all words listed are key. Minor adjustment however made. There are a lot of vegetables in our region of the world. Authors are at a loss as to how many examples will suffice. Authors think it is better to leave it as it is.</p> <p>Effectuated as suggested “South-south Nigeria” inserted This was for phytochemical analysis. See revision As in the First Author's comment above. See Authors comment no.2 above.</p> <p>Journal Author instruction, which is standard practise, is that values in Figures should not be repeated in tables and vice versa. “Crude” expunged in text and Figure. Done Authors comment as in no. 2 comment above. % composition was w/w. This has been included in the Legend Phrase “Our” expunged.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	Many typo, grammar and other minor errors found and given in reviewed manuscript for action.	All typo, grammar and minor errors effected as noted.
Optional/General comments		Reviewer's comments have been most instructive

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	