

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFRN_104458
Title of the Manuscript:	Minerals content of Cleome gynandra and Allium cepa leaves grown in Burkina Faso
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:

<https://journalajfrn.com/index.php/AJFRN/editorial-policy>

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes the manuscript is important for scientific community because it's permit to complete the food composition table from Burkina Faso and have informations about others studies in the same way and make comparisons 2. Yes the title of the article is suitable 3. Yes the abstract of the article is comprehensible but it is suggested not to highlight the parts: objectives, methodology, results and conclusion. In the key words, I suggest adding the country of study 4. Yes, subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate 5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct 6. Yes, the reference works are quite recent, dating from 2023 and 2021, but many of them date between 2012 and 2017. The references illustrate and support the work. <p>Additional suggestions:</p> <p>In the conclusion of the abstract, it is not just a question of contributing to the fight against anaemia, but of contributing to the fight against micronutrient deficiencies. So, in the introduction (the body of the assignment), statistical data from the country are needed to justify the objectives of the study.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Yes, English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Nothing to tell	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Harimalala Andriambelo Nirina
Department, University & Country	Antananarivo University, Madagascar