



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Archives of Current Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_48924
Title of the Manuscript:	Phytochemical Composition, Anti-nutrient Properties and Antioxidant Potentials of Raw Hibiscus sabdariffa Seeds.
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/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Introduction: enough and relevant.</b></p> <p><b>2.1 Materials</b></p> <p>Dried seeds of <i>Hibiscus sabdariffa</i> purchased from Mangu Local Government Area of Plateau state, Nigeria. The seeds were cleaned properly and ground into powder for analysis. Chemicals and reagents used were of high analytical grade.</p> <p>When?</p> <p>Where? GPS location</p> <p>The seeds were cleaned properly (define properly) and ground into powder (size mesh ? how you did that ?) for analysis.</p> <p><b>2.2.1 Extraction of phytochemicals</b></p> <p>Exactly 1g of the sample was weighed and transferred in a test tube and 15ml ethanol and 10ml of 50%<i>m/v</i> potassium hydroxide were added. Why and how you find these conditions? you optimized this procedure?</p> <p>Please, justify all this procedure presented.</p> <p><b>2.2.2 Quantification by GC-FID</b></p> <p>The analysis of the sample was performed on a BUCK M910 Gas chromatography equipped with a flame ionization detector (FID). A RESTEK 15 meter MXT-1 column (15 m x 250 <math>\mu\text{m}</math> x 0.15 <math>\mu\text{m}</math>) was used. The injector temperature was 280 °C with splitless injection of 2 <math>\mu\text{l}</math> of sample and a linear velocity of 30 <math>\text{cm s}^{-1}</math>, Helium 5.0 Psi was the carrier gas with a flow rate of 40 <math>\text{ml min}^{-1}</math>. (how you find this condition?) The oven operated initially at 200 °C, it was heated to 330 °C at a rate of 3 °C <math>\text{min}^{-1}</math> and was kept at this temperature for 5 minutes. The detector operated at a temperature of 320 °C. Phytochemical concentration was determined by the ratio between the area and mass of internal standard (which one?) and the area of the peaks of the identified phytochemicals. The concentrations of the different phytochemicals were expressed in <math>\mu\text{g/ml}</math>. Your method was analytically validated?</p> <p>Have you standards from Table 3 ? the analytical curve each compound is welcome.</p> <p><b>3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</b> Did you use only one extract ? in Ethanol ? Can you extract all your compounds from Tab 1 using ethanol ?</p>	<p>2.1 Done as required, thank you.</p> <p>2.2.1: The procedures and conditions are according to standards of the laboratory.</p> <p>2.2.2 The conditions were set automatically and the internal standards are set according to laboratory's specifications. The method was analytically validated. An appendix has been included containing the chromatogram and the analytical output.</p> <p>3. The result in Table 1 is for the <u>qualitative</u> phytochemical screening that determines the presence of those phytochemicals, while Table 2 is a <u>quantitative</u> analysis that quantifies the amount of specific compound.</p> <p>The signs: Absent (-), Low (+), High (++) , Very High (+++) were used to denote the absence or abundance of the phytochemicals as per the qualitative analysis, which the specific values are stated in Table 2.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p><b>Please: Define</b> Absent (-), Low (+), High (++), Very High (+++)</p> <p>The description your measurements are in general very poor. You need to improve that in all your text.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

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