

Editorial Comments:

I have evaluated the review reports attached to this manuscript and noted that the revised manuscript was allocated a mark of 4 by one reviewer, which harbors along rejection and the need for revision. I further also noted the mark allocations by other reviewers which gave an average of 7.9. The second revision of the manuscript was submitted and having gone through it, I noted the following shortcomings:

1. The second revised version of manuscript is still riddled with elementary errors such as the incorrect writing of the species name and some grammatical errors.
2. The background does not provide a compelling rationale for the undertaking of the study through the identification of the knowledge gap in the ability of the crop to alleviate hepatic injuries which could be linked to the possession of unsaturated fatty acids.

However, having noted the above I also note that the manuscript presents some interesting results. If the author(s) could contextualize the background of the study in a proper manner and do a thorough grammatical editing (which the journal Editors may also assist in), the paper may be publishable.

Author's Feedback:

All recommended corrections have been rightly fixed.