



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Applied Chemistry Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJACR_58558
Title of the Manuscript:	Mineral Content, Proximate Composition and the Antioxidant Properties of the Ethanol Extract of the Fruit Pulp of Doum Palm (Hyphaene thebaica L.)
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy> )

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Materials &amp; methods</b> are well-described with sufficient details.</p> <p><b>Results &amp; discussion.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The data are well controlled.</li> <li>The authors provided relevant and current references during the discussion. <b>However, the additional discussion on the data is required. For instance, the authors pointed that the moisture content in their study is near 2 times higher compared to other works [12,30,34], the same was with the amount of protein and the value of the crude fiber. However, there was no further explanation of why it may happen. Probably, it depends on the habitat of the palm tree, or other researchers have obtained their figures using different methods... I consider the discussion of the differences should not be limited only by an indication of its presence, but also an explanation.</b></li> <li>The discussion is based on actual figures.</li> <li>The data do not need statistical analyses.</li> </ol> <p>The <b>conclusion</b> is not supported by any data. The authors used only general words to conclude their study, however, it would be better to provide the proof expressed in numbers for their claims.</p> <p>The cited <b>references</b> are rather relevant and adequate.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the Introduction there are two sentences which differ slightly, they are almost the same. It would be better to paraphrase the second one (or delete it) in order to avoid the repetitions. I am saying about the following two: Roots of doum palm are used for treatment of bilharzias while the fruit is often chewed to control hypertension. [5] The fruit pulp is also used locally to control hypertension when chewed, while the roots are used in the treatment of bilhaziasis. [11]</li> <li>It is claimed that fruits and other parts of the doum palm are quite useful in medical purposes: "treatment of bilharzias, bleeding and also as haematinic agent. [6,7] The anti-cancer, antioxidant and antimicrobial activities of the fruit pulp of the doum palm have also been well documented. [8,9,10]". To my opinion, it would be better to deepen the introduction describing why the doum palm is so curative. In other words, to point which microelements and other components give the plant certain healing properties. What exactly gives it anti-inflammatory, antibacterial, anticancer and antioxidant activities? I am convinced that this information will highlight the value of the study. However, it is up to the authors to follow this remark or not.</li> <li>In the last paragraph of part 3 the order of the references is wrong: "&lt;...&gt; of the doum palm plant. [37,9,38,10,39,40,41]".</li> <li>In references 5 and 11 the numbers are doubled.</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The study is relevant because it shows the mineral content and composition of the plant which is one of the useful plants of the world and confirms the properties of doum palm trees by reliable methods.	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Aleksandra Mikhailidi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Saint-Petersburg State University of Industrial Technologies and Design, Russia</b>