

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_115649
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Chemical Composition and Physicochemical Properties of Giant Yellow Mulberry Fruit (<i>Myrianthus arboreus</i>)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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. The manuscript generated valuable and detail empirical evidences about the nutritional quality and physicochemical properties of Giant Yellow Mulberry Fruit. This could help to increase wider utilization of this indigenous fruit, and solving malnutrition and ensuring food security. 2. Evaluation of Chemical Composition,Physiochemical and Anit-nutritional Properties of Giant Yellow Mulberry Fruit (<i>Myrianthus arboreus</i>) 3. The abstract failed to indicate the type of experimental design employed. The number of words exceed 150 and number of keywords also more than 5, which are not in line with the journals guideline for authors. 4. Most of the subsections are good, but the objective of this experiment/study is not written at the end of the introduction. Study area is not sufficiently described. The journal requires the result and discussion to be written together, but, the author(s) of this article wrote the results and discussions separately 5. The major problem I have seen is regarding the statistical analysis. This experiment has two factors (pulp and seeds) or compare the results of chemical composition and physiochemical properties between the pulp and seeds. So if we have less than three factors the prepared test is t-test rather than using ANOVA test. Furthermore, the type of ANOVA used is not indicated clearly, i.e., one way ANOVA or tow way ANOVA?. In addition, most of the results are not sufficiently discussed by linking with previous research findings. 6. A number of outdated references used and the author(s) did not strictly adhere to the journals manuscript preparation guideline format. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>There is no major issue related to the English language used in this manuscript.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Overall, this experiment generated detailed and sufficient scientific data that can be useful for scaling up the utilization of this indigenous fruit tree so as to solve the issue of food security and malnutrition.</p> <p>specifically on the statistical analysis, experimental design used, discussion, authors should also include additional recent citations, revisiting the reference as per the journal's manuscript preparation guideline.</p>	

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:	Assen Ebrahim Seid
Department, University & Country	Aksum University, Ethiopia