Comment of Editor:

I have three concerns. First, I recognize that English is not the first language of the authors but as currently written, the paper is very challenging to understand. As an example, the text below is the 7th paragraph in the Discussion section. English is my first language and I found this paragraph to be very challenging to read and comprehend. For readers with English as a second language, this text may take them quite some time to understand.

The leaves, fruits and studied mucilaginous flowers provided some contents relatively in protein in the order of 10.06%. [45] got some contents (11.2%) in the leaves of *A. digitata* near of ours. In return, [46] had bigger concentrations (20.06%) to the level of the leaves of *C. olitorius*. The good proportions could be beneficial to the populations because proteins are essential to the formation and to the repair of the bodily tissue as well as antibodies production, to the functioning and to the growth of the cells [47]. Also, [48] showed the interference of the agricultural techniques with the contents in protein because the use of nitrogenous manure during production could influence the concentrations.

Second, I am having a difficult time understanding the statistical analysis results as described in Tables 2 and 3. The authors indicate that the "Means in column with no common letter differ significantly (P<-.001) for each plant parts.". The letters go from A to K with no indication as to what the different letters represent. Additionally, in Table 2 the dry matter (DM) content for the BB-flower has two letters (FG). This makes the tables appear very busy but provides no real information. If the authors wish to signify statistical significance with a letter, then they should only use the letter in the case of a statistically significant value.

Finally, it is not at all clear what the authors are analyzing for significance. Are they comparing the nutritional contents across the different plant parts or are they comparing the nutritional content for each plant part across the different species of plant? This needs to be clarified in the methods section.

Author's Feedback:

Leaves, fruits and flowers studied provided protein contents in the order of 10.06%. Sena and collaborators [45] obtained similar contents (11.2%) in *A. digitata* leaves, contrary to Dickson [46] who got bigger concentrations (20.06%) in *C. olitorius* leaves. These plants could contribute to the needs of the populations. Indeed, the proteins are essential to the formation of the bodily cloths, to the antibodies production and to the cells functioning [47]. Also, Agbo [48] showed the interference of the agricultural techniques with protein contents because the use of nitrogenous manure during production could influence the concentrations.

Table 2
From the same column, values with different uppercase letters are statistically different at 5% significance. F, statistical value of ANOVA ; p-value, probability value of ANOVA ; DM, dry matter content ; TCE, ash content; TST, total sugars content ; TSR, reducing sugars content ; TPT, polyphenols content.

BB-*flower* 18.96 ± 0.37^{G}

Table 3
From the same column, values with different uppercase letters are statistically different at 5% significance. F, statistical value of ANOVA ; p-value, probability value of ANOVA TMG, lipid content ; TGT, carbohydrate content; TPR, protein content ; VEN, energy value.

In our study, we were comparing the nutritional contents across the different plant parts