



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_43796
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of nutritive value of two traditional African vegetables (Corchorus olitorius and Hibiscus sabdariffa) commonly consumed 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	Lines 28-30. Although there is few information about nutritional composition of <i>Corchorusolitorus</i> and <i>Hibiscus sabdariffa</i>, I suggest to mention some of the available articles, such as: - https://doi.org/10.5897/JMPR11.621, - Ndlovu, J, Afolayan, AJ (2008). Nutritional analysis of the South African wild vegetable <i>Corchorusolitorius</i> L. Asian J Plant Sci - http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/apra.v5i2.49827 Lines 31-33. I suggest to remove this paragraph, because the aim of study was not post-harvest technologies. Section Results Authors need to rewrite this section, because it is confusing and the English should be improved Section discussion. I expected that authors compared their results with other articles, which had studied the same species; however, authors only compared their results with one study. Furthermore, authors described in excess the effects of fat, fiber, minerals and other compounds in human body, which is a topic already described a lot in the literature, for example: - "high contents of lipid in human diet are principal sources of obesity and other relative diseases." But this depends in the fatty acids profile present in food, and probably leafy are a good source of polyunsaturated acids. Furthermore, the amount of fat is low compared with other foods. - "fiber and carbohydrate content of both the leaves of <i>Corchorusolitorus</i> and <i>Hibiscus sabdariffa</i> observed in this study are lower to reported values for a number of tropical plants", "But the leaves of <i>Corchorusolitorus</i> and <i>Hibiscus sabdariffa</i> are a good source of fiber and carbohydrate" So, the values of fiber is lower than other plants, but it is a good source of fiber? Compared to what? This paragraph is confusing. English should be improved. Some sentences are not correct (ex: line 104 "excepted moisture"; p=.05; line 106 "good energizing source", line 155 "But the consumption of vegetables is healthy for the body since excess fat in the body causes cardiovascular disorders")	
Minor REVISION comments	Line 18. Change "prerequisite for human development" for "requirement for human development" Line 28. Put space between words "inone" Line 43. How do the authors know that fresh leaves are ripe? Line 53. Why the fresh leaves were dried first in the air and then in the oven? Lines 62. How long was the Soxhlet extraction? Line 72. Put the reference at the end of the sentence. Table 1. Change commas by points. When the results were described it is not necessary to put the standard deviation. I suggest to only mention means, when authors are describing the obtained results. Line 111. Fiber with lower letters, Line 131. Polyphenols with lower letters Line 146. Until this moment, authors didn't refer the common name for <i>Corchorusolitorus</i> (jute mallow). So, I suggest to write it at the beginning. References: Authors need to standardize references, for example: - Missing volume in some references: Refs 4,6, - Missing year. Ref. 32	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	- The abbreviations of some journals are wrong: Ref 9 "J. of Food Com and Anal.", Correct:.. Food Compos. Anal.; as well as, Ref 14,18, 21, 23, 40, 41.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Line 59. Change Association of official analytical chemist's method for AOAC method Line 74-75. Mineral with lowerletters	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Luana Fernandes</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Centro de Investigação de Montanha (CIMO), Polytechnic Institute of Bragança, Portugal</i>