

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_99659
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutritional Evaluation and Value Addition of Drumstick Leaves
Type of the Article	Short Research Article

### General guidelines 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 the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. <b>1. Yes, it is crucial for the scientific community, but there needs to be a significant improvement in the quality of the grammar and the transfer of information. The author needs to work on his or her English.</b> 2. <b>The title is suitable, but the "Drumstick" needs to be changed to "Moringa Ol...."</b> 3. <b>The Abstract is not comprehensive and needs improvement</b> 4. <b>The subsections are not appropriately arranged and need improvement.</b> 5. <b>The manuscript is scientifically correct but needs major adjustments</b> 6. <b>The references that are cited into the text if all listed are sufficient</b>	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The English is not of a standard that may be used for academic communication.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	This manuscript has to be improved in every way.	

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

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mustapha Suleiman
Department, University & Country	Sokoto state University, Nigeria