

Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJRB_80626 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Nutritional evaluation of Moringa oleifera leaf and the effect of its bio-fortification with animal feed on physical changes and organ weights in male albino rats |
| 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://journalajrb.com/index.php/AJRB/editorial-policy>)

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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>SUMMARY OF THE MAIN FINDINGS OF THE STUDY The manuscript explains a study on the nutritional assessment of the effects of <i>Moringa oleifera</i> mixed with animal feeds on the phenotypic appearance and organ weights in male albino rats.</p> <p>HIGHLIGHTS OF THE LIMITATIONS AND STRENGTHS OF THIS STUDY The title of the study is stimulating and actually depicts the study. The abstract of this study is precise, although should be looked into in terms of some wrong application of grammar. I do not have any problem with the introduction because it is sizable enough, although the authors need to look at some grammatical errors and correct them accordingly.</p> <p>MATERIALS AND METHODS: In the Materials and Methods section, the authors should correct the grammatical errors accordingly. I would like the authors to state the statistical analysis used in the study.</p> <p>RESULTS In this section, the author mentioned in a statement "The differences in contents could be attributed to differences in ecological zones, climatic conditions and the physiological stage of harvesting the <i>Moringa oleifera</i> plants". Can the authors state the contents being referred to? Do they mean the differences in proximate, minerals and vitamins? Please, the authors should specify.</p> <p>The authors kept using MOLM; please, what do the authors mean by MOLM? Is it the same as MOL?</p> <p>The authors stated that in Table 2 it showed the weekly feed consumption of all the rats. It also stated that all groups showed a remarkable weekly increase ($p < 0.05$) in feed consumption. It further stated that groups fed with diets containing MOLM showed a significant reduction ($p < 0.05$) in feed consumption, in dose manners compared with control (A). This statement is not clear. Why was there a reduction in feed consumption? If MOLM means <i>Moringa oleifera</i> leaf mixed with minerals, why will the consumption rate of the rats reduce since the MOL was laced with minerals and vitamins which were supposed to give the mixture a better taste? Please, there should be a better explanation for the rats feed withdrawal.</p> <p>DISCUSSION In the discussion section, the authors stated "The proximate result, percentage (dry matter, proteins and ash contents) of MOL is collaborating with the findings of Patel et al. (2020) as 93.16, 24.44 and 7.44 respectively. The crude protein content of MOL in this study was close to 27.51% reported by Oduro et al. (2008), and 29.55% recorded by Nuhu (2010) in Ghana but higher than 23.30% reported by Gakuya et al. (2014)." This statement is not clear. Please, are the authors comparing the proximate result, percentage (dry matter, proteins and ash contents) in this study with the results from the study of Patel et al., 2020? Are</p> | |

Review Form 1.6

| | | |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
| | <p>93.16, 24.44, 7.44 values from the study of Patel <i>et al.</i>, 2020 or from this study? Please recast</p> <p>The crude protein content in this study was higher than the crude protein content reported by Oduro <i>et al.</i>, 2008; Nuhu, 2010. Please recast.</p> <p>The authors stated that their findings showed that MOL has a body weight reducing potency. Could it not be that the reason why the rats lost some bodyweight is because there was a reduction in feed consumption?</p> <p>REFERENCES Corrections should be made on the references. I would suggest to the authors to look at the corrections at the review section.</p> | |
| Minor REVISION comments | | |
| Optional/General comments | | |
| | The authors should correct and recast the highlighted sections in the review sheet. | |
| | The authors should look at the entire manuscript and correct the grammatical errors. | |

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: | Nnamdi Ifechukwude Chidi |
| Department, University & Country | Nigerian Institute For Oil Palm Research (N.I.F.O.R.), Nigeria |