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

<mark>PART 1:</mark> **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	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. The authors provide very little information on the sample size, sample preparation and how the extraction was carried out. 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. The same applies to phytochemical analysis, describe how you were able to determine the presence or absence of the compounds. Kindly also provide more information on the digestion procedure and amount of sample used for the sample preparation, prior to the mineral analysis. The authors also fail to mention, if the study was carried out in triplicates, which is the standard requirement The statistical analysis section fails to mention the software or excel version used for the analysis. The authors should consider using recent FAO data to highlight the malnutrition status 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 The paper has numerous grammatical errors and running sentences, which need to be corrected	
Minor REVISION comments	Line 5: Is it fruit or fruits? Line 6: Write 'revealed' in place of 'reveal' Line 8: Remove 'while' and start a new sentence from 'The proximate analysis ...' 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?' Line 11: Write 'consisted of' in place of consist Line 24: re-write to 'largely depends on' Line 25: Re-write to 'test of time' Line 29: write 'sources' in place of source and provides in place of provide Line 33: write 'needs' in place of need Line 34: Add 's' to 'specie' Line 37 -40: Please re-write the sentence and make it clear Line 41-43: Break the sentence into two Line 44: Rewrite to 'reduces the risk of hypertension'	

	Line 46: Is it a joint dislocation?	
Optional/General comments	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. 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.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	*Redemtor Awuor Ojwang*
Department, University & Country	*University of Nairobi, Kenya*