

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFRN_119905
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimized state of extraction of phenolic compounds of <i>Boschia senegalensis</i> (Pers.) Lam. ex Poir. and evaluation of their antihyperglycemic activities
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://journalajfrn.com/index.php/AJFRN/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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1 This work is a great scientific research in view of the subject and promising results.</p> <p>2 The title is well formulated.</p> <p>3 the summary is comprehensive but the various subsections are not well structured.</p> <p>4 The various subsections of a scientific article are respected in this work and are in line with the authors' guideline.</p> <p>5 The scientific quality of the document is very good, but some parts need to be improved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the section total reducing power section is not complete - the penultimate section of the introduction needs to be improved for better understanding, as the work is taking place in Chad. The second sentence of the paragraph does not have the same idea as the first. - other work on the species studied could be stated in the introduction and also used to improve the discussion <p>6 The bibliographical references are numerous and recent, but the style of the author guideline is not respected when quoting in the text. The type of document is not mentioned for certain references in the reference section.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is comprehensible and the writing style is good.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This study is of good scientific quality and the subject is of great scientific and social importance.</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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dicko Amadou
Department, University & Country	Centre Nationale de Recherche Scientifique et Technologique (CNRST), Institut de l'Environnement et de Recherches Agricoles (INERA), Burkina Faso