

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Plant Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_APRJ_78106
Title of the Manuscript:	NUTRITIONAL EVALUATION OF <i>Brillantaisia patula</i> LEAVES
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://www.journalapj.com/index.php/APRJ/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Recommended revisions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. The abstract is too long and exceeds 300 words. I suggest that the authors should conclude the work (abstract) based on their result and not to rewrite the result in the conclusion section II. The third and fourth paragraph in section 1 (introduction) is a repetition of the first and second paragraph. III. It is not clear how amino acid analysis was carried out as its procedure cannot be found in the reference provided. I suggest that the authors need to describe evaluation of amino acid in details since its a major aspect of their research 	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Methodology The leaves were washed with distilled water and air dried for about two weeks. – at what temperature and was the air drying carried out in a kitchen, laboratory or an empty room The dried leaves were milled into uniform powder with the aid of a Marlex blender – please give the model</p> <p>2.4 Determination of mineral content</p> <p>Potassium and sodium were determined using a flame photometer (Corning, UK Model 405). KCl and NaCl were used to prepare the standards. Phosphorus was determined by vanadomolybdate colorimetric. All other metals were determined by atomic absorption spectrophotometer (Bulk Scientific East Norwalk, CT, USA). – since you did not describe these methods in details I suggest you reference the methods used for reproducibility of your research</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>Result:</p> <p>Table 1. Proximate composition of leaves (%) and calculated energy (kJ/100g) – I suggest the authors should include the unit of the parameter in the table and not in the title of the table</p> <p>Table 4. Amino acids composition of <i>B. patula</i> leaves (g/100g crude protein). - I suggest the authors should include the unit of the parameter in the table and not in the title of the ta</p>	

Review Form 1.6

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:	<i>Ijeoma Chidinma Akujobi</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Imo State University, Nigeria</i>