



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_28217
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of biochemical properties from seeds and oil deriving with sweet pea (Cyperus esculentus L.) in Côte d'Ivoire
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	1. Line 182 statement was plagiarised! 2. Explain how the sample was identified and confirmed.	1. The phrase is modified yet to fit the main concerns against plagiarism. 2. The sampling clearly highlights that there was any need for identification of the samples: 9 saleswomen * 9 markets were considered in 3 communes in Abidjan, leading to total of 810 kg of sweet pea seeds gathered for many studies in our project. Such arrangements aimed to result in significant, consistent, and representative sampling from the entire town of Abidjan. For the nutritive investigations, 5 kg were considered after having carefully mixed the overall samples. THERE WERE NO NEED OF SAMPLE IDENTIFICATION AND CONFIRMATION.
Minor REVISION comments	1. Change title: Physico-chemical and Nutritive Assessment s of Seeds and Oil Extracted from <i>Cyperus esculentus</i> (sweet pea) Marketed in Abidjan, Cote d'Ivoire 2. Re-check grammar 3. Conclusion should consist of the finding of the study 4. Re-arrange keywords in alphabetical order	1. As many physico-chemical properties are really searched also in the study, especially from the sweet pea seeds oil, it's quite reasonable to account this in the title. So the title is improved as: "Physico-chemical and Nutritive properties of seeds and oil deriving from the sweet pea (<i>Cyperus esculentus</i>) marketed in Côte d'Ivoire". 2. OK. We checked the manuscript for possible errors. 3. OK for the comment. Yet the conclusion is checked and is now only about the finding in the study.



SDI Review Form 1.6

		4. OK! The keywords is rearranged alphabetically.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. Be consistent when referring to biochemical properties (chemical vs biochemical) 2. Relative density and moisture content are physical properties 3. Enrich discussion by comparing this study with other similar works e.g. http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/njbas.v21i4.1	1. OK. Chemical components accounting biological effects are theoretically considered as Biochemical traits (glucides, fatty acids, proteins, etc.). We agree that both terms are of course different; and we improved the document theresoo, especially from the step involving the sweet pea seeds oil. 2. OK. Yes of course! 3. Thanks for the proposition. Nevertheless, in the full discussion section, many authors (author 32 to Author 48) were constantly referred to, including numerous comparisons of our findings with other reports. We downloaded the contribution indicated in this address. It will be duly considered in interpretation of results from further attempts. Thank you.