Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_ IJBCRR_44652**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Evaluation of the nutrients, antinutrients and metals content of five leafy vegetables in Dengi metropolis**
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 Line 43 - 80:	Introduction should be more eye catching and meaningful. What is missing for examples: why these kinds of five vegetables were selected? What are their previous purpose in the community? Then, please highlight a bit about Dengi metropolis, where is it and what are the food habits/ pattern of the consumption? That are missing!	
Line 68 – 70:	I do not understand what is the correlation of these sentences !	
Line 71 – 80:	These should be put after line 51, then please start with each minerals (functions and side effects if these mineral traces are not adequate in terms of quantity in human body). You can try with definitions of anti-nutritional factors are, what are they in general. Then you can then come to those minerals that you were investigated in your work, and give 2 sentences why you have interests to investigate them?	
Line 82 -98:	Please clarify each abbreviation that you wrote, as not all people are from your study backgrounds.	
Line 86 – 87:	Please explain each abbreviation and then please highlight in general, how do these machine work? For digital balance for instance, you should write down, how many digital after the comma, and how does PTH amino acid analyser work? In very general.	
Line 89 -91:	Samples, should be write down how much did you weigh, in what unit? Sieving with what? And what was the size of the mesh/ filter that you conducted?	
Line 105-108:	Please elaborate and briefly explain each measurement (tannins), tota oxalate, what values were determined, then after that, did you determine them further with a fix number? (e.g. protein= N value X 6.25)= the result of protein content in an organic substance. The way you explain is too shallow and unprecise!	
Minor REVISION comments **Line 90:**	Washed with what? How many times Air dried, how? Please describe more such as air dried in oven, with what Temperature or lyophyllized?	
Line 93:	The reference is relatively old, can you find a more updated one (over the past max. 8 years?). Second, please describe briefly what were the method useful for? Just highlight how the method works? Did you prepare replicates or only single sample per number? Also: how many samples did you prepare in total? If you have 5 kinds of vegetables/ leaves, then how many prepared for each trait (e.g. for amino acids, protein, mineral traces (6 traits), then the last, anti nutrients (2 traits). Please indicate clearly!	
Line 95:	600- 800 volume unit? The resulting residue? How much (g) Then dried? How? (similar to line 90)	

SDI Review Form 1.6

Line 100:	The mineral assessment was done in replicates? If yes, did you take the mean values from two replicates? What machine? Name, company? Did you do calibration, previously or before each measurement?	
Line 105:	You wrote antinutrients, but in line 220/ Table 3, you mentioned with Phytochemical content. Please make it more clearly as anti-nutrients mean always adverse effects for human body, while phytochemicals are used to be applied in the terminology of trace study of fertilizer and they do not always mean negative for human body! Please choose one suitable terminology which relates exactly with your works.	
Line 114:	For phytochemicals, what traits were assessed? You did mention in line 220/ Table 3. I better suggest you to put the information before!	
Line 113 – 124:	Author should add more the information of utilization of those 5 types of vegetables and what are their importance, also this would be useful if they could provide the general/ trivial name?	
Line 126 – 143:	The relatively high content of amino acids or positive compound should be related with the current nutritional standard of most of African people esp. young children. Are they worth to be consumed or not? If yes, why? If no, also why?	
Line 113 – 210:	Results and Discussion part is 50% OK, only that author put too much information from theoretical sources without connecting it with their own results. They should also compare their results with other works whether their findings have supported the previous results or *vice versa*. Author seem only to compare their results with the UN-standard, whether this is below or above but they forget to emphasize their own national nutritional standard which may vary from one African country to another. This would add their work more interesting for an outsider!	
Line 223 – 230:	Please add the value of this research in supporting the nutritional status in Africa, particularly among young children. What are the suggestion or plan for the next research intention (2 sentences)!	
Optional/General comments	The results and discussion is already adequate for a scientific information, but more detailed information esp. by the materials and methods should be corrected. By doing so, reader know that you really did your work as the more detailed information you share at your M & M, the better meaning that other could reference your work in the future! Also it gives an impression that you did your work according to the previous references!	

PART 2:

	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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	*Rita Andini*
Department, University & Country	*Syiah Kuala University, Indonesia*