

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJFRN_119905</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Optimized state of extraction of phenolic compounds of <i>Boschia senegalensis</i> (Pers.) Lam. ex Poir. and evaluation of their antihyperglycemic activities</b>
Type of the 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><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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The topic is a timely necessity but the presentation and methodology is technically erroneous and muddled up. It is not clearly presented and the methodology seems to be wrong since it is not clear at all.</p> <p>If truly the method of extraction was optimized the title is suitable BUT the methodology did not clearly show the optimization. It was muddled up.</p> <p>NO</p> <p>NO</p> <p>NO</p> <p>YES</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	NO	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is not easy to read at all due to typographical and grammatical errors. Also the presentation from the abstract is full of errors. The methodology is NOT CLEAR AT ALL. The optimization process and the rats experiments were not presented clearly and there are technical errors in the presentation.</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>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Paulina Oludoyin Adeniyi
Department, University & Country	International Institute for Policy Review and Development Strategies (IIPRDS), Nigeria