



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#"><u>International Journal of Biochemistry Research &amp; Review</u></a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJBCRR_34901</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Proximate and phytochemical profile of Melanthera biflora</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>It is an interesting topic but unless the authors describe concisely the analysis of the different phytochemical found, as well, as the statistical analysis. The methodology of extraction, GC analyses and identification of the different compounds should be included.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is an important lack of references <b>in</b> introduction</li> <li>- The methodology for the determination of phytochemicals profile is absent and unavoidable in a paper with these characteristics.</li> </ul> <p>Also no statistical analyses was conducted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Line 141-143: if there is a 7 % of protein in the plant it is impossible to cover the daily protein requirement with 100 g of the plant.</li> <li>- No bifloratoxin was found? Or it was not analysed? It is a toxic aminoglycoside reported in this plant by MacLeod et al (1990)</li> </ul>	Ok
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>Line 6: protein content was 7.0 not 70            Line 17: zeaxanthin            Line 45 reference is not connected in the text.            Line 49: which vitamins?            Lines 64-67: I recommend to carefully check the grammar.            Line 69: cold running?</p>	Ok



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>Line 95: % composition is referred to relative composition from total Alkaloids? Line 125: discussion. Line 147-149: this information is not necessary. Eliminate it please. Line 179: punctuation marks?</p> <p>Line 2017: previous to the recommend this plant for functional purposes it should be necessary to check the presence of toxic compounds.</p>	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	<p>Check carefully the grammar, there are many grammatical mistakes, lack of capital letters. Check also the style to call the references into the text</p>	Ok

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>