



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 author has done a good job. The abstract is well concise and gives a good summary of the work. The introduction and result/discussion are well informative. The findings from this research have justified the traditional use of the plant material for both nutritional and medicinal purposes.</p> <p>However, I wish to point out the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the material and method section, the author failed to mention the authentication (if any) of the plant material. There should be authentication by a qualified botanist/ taxonomist, with voucher specimen deposition and voucher number obtained. 2. The tables should be placed inside the text, as indicated in the journal policy. 3. Statistical analysis—the author can expatiate more on how the computation was done, and if there is any level of significance. 4. Reference style—the author should follow the journal policy on both in-text reference citing and referencing at the end of the paper. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The plant had been authenticated by a botanist and voucher number added 2. The tables have been placed appropriately inside the text 3. Only the mean of triplicate determinations were computed 4. We have re done the references to conform to your style guide
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Line 40 under introduction section. Ripped. Could it be that the author has meant ripe or ripened? 2. Line 106 in result and discussion section. Patronize should be changed to patronized. 3. Line 133. The author included carbohydrates among phytochemicals. This could be looked into and amended. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We have effected this correction In line 40 2. We have effected this change in line 106 3. We have deleted 'carbohydrate' in line 133
Optional/General comments		