

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCS_97620
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutritional, antinutritional, antioxidant capacity and fatty acids composition on Bambara groundnut (<i>Vigna subterranean</i>) in comparison with others <i>Vigna</i> spp.
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:

(<https://www.journalajocs.com/index.php/AJOCS/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes No. (Suggested title will be: Comparative Phytochemical Analysis of Bambara groundnut (<i>Vigna subterranean</i>) and others <i>Vigna</i> spp. With respect to its nutritional, antinutritional and antioxidant properties) Yes Yes Yes Yes	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	1. Arrange the key words in alphabetical orders 2. Plants authentication and identification should be done from botany department and details for the same should be included in methodology section 3. Result tables should have significance P values 4. GCMS chromatogram should be visible properly 5. Conclusion is not up to the mark, kindly rewrite it	

PART 2:

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anup Hendre
Department, University & Country	Krishna Vishwa Vidyapeeth, India