



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_41714
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutritional and Phytochemical Composition of Vitellaria paradoxa (Shea fruit pulp)
Type of the 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	<p>The data provided in this manuscript is too little for a full original research article, the authors may consider quantifying some of the phytochemicals found to be present, to make the study more informative and add to the data.</p> <p>The authors provide very little information on the sample size, sample preparation and how the extraction was carried out.</p> <p>The authors should provide more information on the assays carried out in the methodology section. Outline the specific assays used in proximate analysis. Please note that there are a number of techniques that can be used for determination of protein, lipids etc.</p> <p>The same applies to phytochemical analysis, describe how you were able to determine the presence or absence of the compounds.</p> <p>Kindly also provide more information on the digestion procedure and amount of sample used for the sample preparation, prior to the mineral analysis.</p> <p>The authors also fail to mention, if the study was carried out in triplicates, which is the standard requirement</p> <p>The statistical analysis section fails to mention the software or excel version used for the analysis.</p> <p>The authors should consider using recent FAO data to highlight the malnutrition status</p> <p>Line 32: Use a more recent source and if possible provide the latest statistics of the child malnutrition status in the country/area of study according to WHO or FAO</p> <p>The paper has numerous grammatical errors and running sentences, which need to be corrected</p>	<p>1. No comment</p> <p>2. We believe we described these in our materials methods</p> <p>3. We had referenced the methods used in the proximate, mineral and phytochemicals analyses. Since they are standard methods we did not bother to give elaborate details</p> <p>4. We have effected this correction, the work was done in triplicates</p> <p>5. The triplicate data obtained in this study was computed using SPSS version 20 software</p> <p>6. We only have in our possession FAO (2005)</p> <p>7. This is noted and most of grammatical errors have been addressed</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Line 5: Is it fruit or fruits?</p> <p>Line 6: Write 'revealed' in place of 'reveal'</p> <p>Line 8: Remove 'while' and start a new sentence from 'The proximate analysis ...'</p> <p>Line 8: Write 'revealed that the percentage composition of the fruit was as follows: moisture (75.4) etc'.....and please indicate the units. Is it 'g/100g?'</p> <p>Line 11: Write 'consisted of' in place of consist</p> <p>Line 24: re-write to 'largely depends on'</p> <p>Line 25: Re-write to 'test of time'</p> <p>Line 29: write 'sources' in place of source and provides in place of provide</p> <p>Line 33: write 'needs' in place of need</p> <p>Line 34: Add 's' to 'specie'</p> <p>Line 37 -40: Please re-write the sentence and make it clear</p> <p>Line 41-43: Break the sentence into two</p> <p>Line 44: Rewrite to 'reduces the risk of hypertension'</p>	<p>Line 5: 'fruits' this has been effected</p> <p>Line 6: 'revealed' has been effected</p> <p>Line 8: We have done the corrections as suggested by the reviewer</p> <p>Line 11: We have effected this correction 'consisted'</p> <p>Line 24: The suggestions of the reviewer has been effected</p> <p>Line 25: We have effected this correction 'test of time'</p> <p>Line 29: the two corrections as suggested by the reviewer has been effected- 'sources'; 'provides'</p> <p>Line 33: We have effected this correction 'needs'</p> <p>Line 34: This has be effected 'species'</p> <p>Line 37-40: we have rephrased the sentence as suggested by the reviewer.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 46: Is it a joint dislocation?	Line 41-43: We have rephrased this portion as suggested Line 44: The changes suggested has been effected Line 46: We have removed the dislocation
Optional/General comments	<p>The data presented is too little for an original research article and may be publishable as a short communication, if the technical concerns are addressed.</p> <p>The authors should consider adding data on proximate analysis of samples under different preservation treatments and do ANOVA analysis of how the composition varies in these treatments.</p>	<p>No comment</p> <p>Noted</p>