

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Applied Life Sciences International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JALSI_86515
Title of the Manuscript:	NUTRITIONAL AND ANTI-NUTRITIONAL COMPOSITIONS OF THE LEAVES AND STEM BARK OF <i>Ficus glumosa</i>
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://www.journaljalsi.com/index.php/JALSI/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	No apply.	
Minor REVISION comments	No apply.	
Optional/General comments	<p>It is an interesting manuscript about nutritional and anti-nutritional content of Ficus glumosa leaves. It has a high potential impact within Research about new Nutraceutical compounds from natural products. This manuscript merits to be published. Please consider the following observations and suggestions prior publication: i) In the Introduction please try to add information about the state of the knowledge about the afforded topic related with leave components in order to highlight and justify this Research work. In similar manner it should be mentioned the meaning of anti-nutritional components and main structures to open then to show the compounds contemplated in this work. ii) In material and Methods; it should be added methods of extraction of other nutrients. It was just only described proteins. iii) It is suggested to highlight the differences from other studies cited or try to justify and highlight this Research work based on the methodology, values obtained, focused analysis, etc., in order to help to readers to find differences in comparison to other reports. iv) In the Results section consider to change the word "proximate". If it is need it add a mention about non-completion of analysis of all the constituents; or partial analysis(?). v) The conclusions should be improved. It is too short this section and it mentions just only general observations. In this context try to incorporate the previous suggestions mentioned.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Guillermo Bracamonte
Department, University & Country	National University of Cordoba, Argentine