



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_48409
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutritional and Phytochemical Characteristics of CaesalpinioideaeSeeds
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>)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The work is original. 2. The manuscript is well written. 3. Rb and Pb are not known nutrients, and thus should be excluded in the mineral content. 4. Boron (B), Iodine (I), Silicon (Si) and Vanadium (V) are known nutrients, and should be subjected to the investigation. 5. It would be nice if the protein and vitamins were included in the research. 6. Protein should be omitted in conclusion section (line 239) 	<p>3. We agree that Rb, Pb and other heavy metals are not nutrients. They have been determined so as to assess if pollution in the area could lead to high HM concentrations in the seeds, which could result in health hazards, but we concluded that it was not the case. The sentence in the abstract which was inaccurate (HMs were listed in a parenthesis together with micro- and macronutrients) has been corrected.</p> <p>4. Please note that the X-ray fluorescence analysis of boron is complicated by its low atomic number and its low K shell energy (as explained in doi: 10.1016/0040-6090(88)90013-2). Consequently, we cannot provide an estimation of B content in the seeds. Values for I, Si and V have been included in Table 2, and Table 3 has been updated accordingly.</p> <p>5. The protein contents have been included in Table 1 (we had used them for the caloric value calculation, but they were omitted in the table). Changes have been made to section 3.3 to briefly comment on the obtained values, and in other sentences all throughout the text. As regards the vitamins content, we cannot have it characterized in less than a week (time allowed by the Editor to provide a revised version). We thank the Reviewer for his/her suggestion, that we will take into consideration with a view to future studies.</p> <p>6. In line with previous response, now that protein contents have been indicated, it should be fine to keep this information in the conclusions.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	There are some grammar and formatting problems that need to be revised and corrected.	Apparently, there was a problem with the MS Word version and some spaces were missing all throughout the manuscript. The problem has been fixed, and the format of all references and tables has also been revised. The grammar has been checked again in Grammarly, apart from using the in-built MS Word grammar correction tool.
Optional/General comments		



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

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