

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Plant Research Journal</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_APRJ_105426</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Phytochemical and Nutritional Profile, Mineral Ratio and Mineral Safety Index of Young and Matured Corn Silk Collected from Ekiti State, Nigeria</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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.journalapj.com/index.php/APRJ/editorial-policy> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This article provides important information regarding the phytochemical and nutritional profile, mineral ratio and mineral safety index of young and matured corn silk collected from Ekiti State, Nigeria;</li> <li>- The title is adequate to the content of the article;</li> <li>- The abstract of the article is well written, adequately explains the research setting and issues;</li> <li>- The introduction does not provide an adequate description of the problem addressed and shows the significance of the research problem. The methodology used is not clearly described, should be restructured, providing a more detailed description and is not reported in other similar studies. The results are interesting and important for researchers in relevant areas of medicine;</li> <li>- The purpose or goal of the work is within the journal's scope;</li> <li>- I recommend the inclusion of a larger number of more recent studies on the subject and their insertion in bibliographic references.</li> </ul> <p>However, some minor corrections should be made in order to publish the article. Please, take into account the following recommendations to improve this manuscript:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The general presentation of the manuscript should be reviewed, the extra spaces between words or the lack of spaces between titles, subtitles, table and text according to the requirements of the journal;</li> <li>- I recommend editing the entire manuscript as required by the journal, the writing is aligned Left;</li> <li>- I recommend a revision of the manuscript according to the requirements of the journal (English, technical editing, bibliography, etc.);</li> <li>- I recommend a critical approach to the literature to enable analysis and interpretation of the information, development of an objective viewpoint and the setting of clear objectives;</li> <li>- I recommend the complete insertion of the table on a single page (see: tables 4 and 7);</li> <li>- I recommend replacing the unit of measurement "ml" with mL throughout the manuscript;</li> <li>- The presentation of the Conclusions is very short;</li> <li>- I recommend that conclusions be formulated highlighting the importance of the results obtained;</li> </ul> <p>Based on the above mentioned, I recommend this paper for publication after performing the suggested corrections.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>I recommend a carefully check of the full manuscript to correct any grammatical or syntax error.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Daniela Stoin</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Life Sciences "King Michael I", Romania</b>