



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_29987
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutritive Composition and Antimicrobial Activity of Moringa stenopetala (Baker f.) Cufod
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	A good research work but needs to be improved. The result section of your abstract was more like a prose. Please put some quantifiable data there. The introduction needs to be improved by citing some works on the nutrient potentials of Moringa stenopetala . Under the methodology, please change Nutritive Value to Energy Value (that is exactly what you did. In your result, under minerals, convert the units (ppm) to mg/100g. This will help you when you are comparing your results to other work. The other works you cited had their values in mg/100g. Improve on your discussion with more recent literature. Your conclusion was too wide. Please narrow it to your study results and give some recommendations	The abstract is improved by including the data. Nutritive value changed as energy value The results represented for minerals is in ppm and the value is directly from the ICP-OES and literature shows in the previous studies the different authors used different instruments like AAS or spectroflurometer. Hence, we prefer to use ppm instead of mg/100gm. The discussion is improved and conclusion is changed. Recommendation has included.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		