



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Applied Chemistry Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJACR_40617
Title of the Manuscript:	NUTRITIONAL COMPOSITIONS OF SELECTED GREEN LEAFY VEGETABLES IN OYO STATE, NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Review paper

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	<p>CF is an archaic method to evaluate the fibre content of feedstuffs why not use ADF and NDF. The carbohydrate content in abstract is not informative because CF is carbohydrate need to elaborate which component (soluble vs insoluble)</p> <p>Methodology</p> <p>The method number is required for AOAC methods for each and every nutrient determined</p> <p>It is not clear which leaves were analysed, this can have a bearing on the results.</p> <p>There is no model in this study how was variance handled , its also not clear how many samples per each plant were collected and subjected to proximate analysis</p> <p>Line 107 shows that ash contents were used in the analysis of minerals, but the results section or abstract are silent about this analysis why????</p> <p>It is more appropriate to use SE instead of SD in tables that makes it easy to look at the differences between means.</p> <p>Table 1 was not introduced its just thrown in text with no explanation</p> <p>Plants were collected from Ibadan, (line 88)</p> <p>Ogbomoso, Oyo, Igboora, Iseyin, and Saki all in Oyo State, obviously there is bound to be a site variation in this study which was never talked about .</p> <p>Line 117 there is repetition of tabulated results in text</p> <p>Conclusion sounds like a discussion ??????</p> <p>References are mixed up check line 219 and 222</p> <p>References are not to the correct format check line 235 -237, 260, 278 and 321</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The paper can be reorganised to meet the minimum standards if the methodology is revisited.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Washaya Soul
Department, University & Country	Agriculture, Africa University, Zimbabwe