



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_34901
Title of the Manuscript:	Proximate and phytochemical profile of Melanthera biflora
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The abstract, introduction, methodology and other aspects of this work need to be overhauled</p> <p>A. TITLE: The title requires slight modification</p> <p>"Proximate and phytochemical profile of <i>Melanthera biflora</i> leaves"</p> <p>B. ABSTRACT:</p> <p>i. The author did not give any background study and aim of the work.</p> <p>ii. A brief study design, location and period of collection of plant materials, would have guided the reader more.</p> <p>iii. The methodology used for this work</p>	Ok



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>should be stated.</p> <p>iv. The results were poorly presented and the conclusion did not reflect the results presented in the abstract.</p> <p>Lines 4: The part of the plant used should be stated.</p> <p>Lines 12, 15, 17, 20 and 22: The use of "<i>and others in insignificant amount</i>" in the abstract was not necessary as only significant values of interest to the work would have driven the message home. This phrase should be removed.</p> <p>Line 19: Terpinen- 4-01 should be "Terpinen-1-ol".</p> <p>Line 35: One or more keywords needed.</p> <p>C. INTRODUCTION:</p>	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>i. The introduction is not elaborate and contains wrong tenses. It did not give the requisite background information on the plant, its distribution and the use in the said region.</p> <p>ii. There was no justification for the experimental analysis.</p> <p>iii. The references are too few and old therefore, not acceptable.</p> <p>Lines 46 and 47: See reference format in author guideline.</p> <p>Line 49: Vitamins or Vitamin Make correction</p> <p>Lines 50: Tropical rainforest are natural and the emphasis “a great natural tropical...” is irrelevant.</p> <p>Line 53: The sentence should be “That</p>	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>zone” not “this zone”.</p> <p>Line 55: The sentence should be restructured and the word “akuwa” deleted.</p> <p>D. MATERIALS AND METHODS:</p> <p>i. State the season of the year and the month of collection of plant from the plantation.</p> <p>ii. At what temperature was the powder stored in the refrigerator.</p> <p>iii. The carbohydrate calculation by difference is wrong as crude fibre was omitted</p> <p>iv. Give the make and model of the instrument used for gas</p>	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>chromatography</p> <p>E. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:</p> <p>i. The major finding of the work was not properly reported</p> <p>ii. It appears that the data for phytochemical profile was not subjected to any form of statistical analysis. If the data generated was in triplicate it should be statistically presented.</p> <p>iii. The table format should be change to remove the lines</p> <p>iv. The end note in line 122 should be deleted.</p> <p>v. What does the author set achieve from</p>	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>this experiment? How can existing literature buttress this. Has any work been carried out on the plant? What are the phytochemicals present in the plant to make it nutritionally and medicinally important. These and other questions are yet to be addressed in the introduction and discussion</p> <p>vi. The closing statement in line 173 and 174 is ambiguous</p> <p>vii. The result and discussion should be re-written in line with the format in the author guideline.</p> <p>F. REFERENCES:</p> <p>i. The references the text and reference section does not all conform with the</p>	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	journal requirement. Please see author guideline.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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>