



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_19811
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUTION OF NUTRITIONAL, ANTI-NUTRITIONAL, ELEMENTAL CONTENT AND AMINO ACID PROFILE OF Azanza garckaena (GORON TULA)
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	*General comments about the manuscript: - The term "anti-nutritional" (used also in the title of the manuscript) should be used with careful, since some compounds as flavonoids and tannins are nowadays considered beneficial for human health; - <i>Introduction</i>: it would be better a Figure to show the plant and its parts (with indication of the main characteristics of the each part of the plant), instead of the three last paragraphs of the introduction; - <i>Materials</i>: the strategy used for sampling is not mentioned; - <i>Methods</i>: the principles and some important details of the analytical methods are not described, which compromise the judgment of the data (for ex.: what was the methodology used for crude fibre? The methodology for crude fibre is not valid anymore because it underestimates the real content of fibre of the food. In the other hand, the result for fruit's fibre is too high – 45.3% (?). What are the conditions used for obtaining the extracts used for analysing the phenols, flavonoids and tannins (and what are the conditions used for these analyses too)?;	Agreed, and we have decided to rather use "non-nutritional" a term which now carry the essential functionality of the substances. Agreed, and this has been included. The principles, conditions and details of the methods used can be found in the references given (some of which are our previous work). This format of presentation aim to reduce the volume of the work, which is acceptable. With the establishment that the results from different methods used in the analysis of a sample may vary, and that the efficiency of a method may also vary based on the nature of different sample, I disagree with the fact that the method used is invalid. It could although be another research, to check the efficiency of other methods in determining the crude fibre in <i>A. garckaena</i>. However, the method used in this work has given a good picture of crude fibre present, and comparatively, the quantity. For high 45.3% crude fibre, are we now saying the



SDI Review Form 1.6

	- Results are described without standard deviation and statistical analysis, and there are a problem with the values – Tables 1 and 3 show values in g/100 g and the sum of these values for one sample, for instance, for fruit, is 156,7% (?); Tab. 6 is incomplete since do not compare the results with human requirements of essential amino acids); - Discussion: the results are not really interpreted and the revision about the theme is not updated; - Conclusion is not consistent – for instance: “...appreciable levels of nutrients” (what does it means?) - this affirmation is not suitable for a scientific conclusion; “...essential amino acids were found in appreciable amounts” – this affirmation is not consistent (the authors did not compare the samples contents of the amino acids with the human requirements).	method invalidated ‘because it underestimates the real content of fibre of the food’ is now giving a too high value? This kind of made the comment inconsistent. However, data presented in this manuscript are true and genuine. Standards are provided in the references accordingly presented in the discussion. And table six is complete, as comprehensive information of the amino acid profile of <i>A. garckaena</i> is therein presented. 156.7% total in fruits is nowhere true in this manuscript. However, a typographical error in which 39.00 instead of 30.00 was entered for saponins in the leaves have been corrected. We also believe the discussion is good enough. Standards and human requirements are presented in references, which are accordingly included in this manuscript. And the values obtained are tagged ‘appreciable’ as they are neither too low nor high compared to the references consulted and documented in the work.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript is poorly written, in terms of Methodology and of the Results shown (empirical base), and of the Introduction and Discussion (theoric base); and the conclusion is not consistent (see comments below)*	Even though some corrections and additions has been made, we believe a keener review will yield a better comment than ‘poor’.