



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_29595
Title of the Manuscript:	MACRO AND MICRONUTRIENT PROFILE OF SELECTED WILD EDIBLE PLANTS CONSTITUTING DIETS OF PREGNANT WOMEN IN BUIKWE DISTRICT, UGANDA
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Authors are suggested to discuss the overview of appropriate doses of the studied plants for the pregnant woman. Increasing dose of some plants/extract, such as <i>C. gynandra</i> , to meet RDA level resulting in the overdose of some vitamins and minerals which may cause toxicity.	Dear reviewer thanks for the comment. Appropriate doses for the studied plants could not be discussed because efficacy, toxicity and bioavailability studies on these species have not been scientifically established as per our study thus manuscript. Therefore it could not be evidently conclusive discussing appropriate doses because all those factors come into play and should be analysed to make such conclusions. The amount to be consumed in (g) is entirely based on mathematical calculations of geometric mean to get percentage pregnancy RDA contribution per species. Then backward calculation helped us establish amount of (g) to consume per 100 g of dry sample.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Abstract: Instrument model (AAS) and statistical analysis should be mentioned in Methodology section, not in abstract. 2. Methodology: Time/date and location of sample collection should be presented. 3. References: Please re-check the order of reference lists (Ref 22 missing?). 4. Some typing errors should be rectified (e.g. <i>S. anguivii</i> in Fig.1, L (line 112)). 5. Some references are out of format. Uniformity must be ensured in all the references.	1. Instrument model and statistical analysis have been deleted from the abstract 2. Date and location of sample collection site have been added. 3. Reference 22 has been cited in the text 4. <i>S. anguivi</i> has been corrected and figure replaced 5. All references have been corrected and aligned to same format
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	-	