



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_56857
Title of the Manuscript:	PROXIMATE AND MINERAL COMPOSITION OF SPONGE SEED (<i>Luffa cylindrica</i>) GROWN IN SOUTH-WESTERN NIGERIA
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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



[SDI 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>Title Change to: PROXIMATE AND MINERAL COMPOSITION OF SPONGE GOURD (<i>Luffa cylindrica</i>) SEED GROWN IN SOUTH-WESTERN NIGERIA</p> <p>Abstract Can be shown as 30.63% w/w instead. Do the same for all other minerals. No need as 30.63g/100g. 28.93% is not really the lowest mineral content for Magnesium. Consider rephrasing sentence. Not an acceptable conclusion to state "recommended as an inclusion to man and animal diets" unless compared the results with some standard nutritional data. Remove and conclude differently. Perhaps highlight the seed being a good source of protein instead as it is found with high protein. Be more specific in drawing conclusion and related to results.</p> <p>Introduction Why all the citations not starting from number 1 but rather 25? Not common for any journal. Remove word "activity" from figure referred as scheme 1. Why is the figure stated as scheme?</p> <p>Material and Method 'The <i>L. cylindrica</i> fruits were collected from a farmland in Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria'any gps coordinate? Provide brands and models of AAS and FES equipment stated. yellow method by spectrophotometer (Ghallenkamp). Why no numbering for the citation here? For all g/100g stated no need to mention g per 100g instead as % w/w sufficient for all. FAO/WHO data can be used to decide whether your data exceed its requirements for all other nutrition. Can? Some of the facts given without any proper citation hence suggested to include appropriately e.g. : <i>The ratio of Na/K (0.59) was less than one, which implies that the sample will not promote high blood pressure. Food is considered "good" if the Ca/P ratio is above one and "poor" if it is less than one, therefore, the Ca/P ratio of the sample were less than one, this implies that the samples could be consider "poor".</i></p>	

Comment [H1]: Any gps coordinate?

Comment [H2]: Why not numbered?

Comment [H3]: Need reference here



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Conclusion provide sufficient amount</p> <p>Before stating this have you compared to FAO/WHO for all your data within the recommendation or not?</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Some minor typo errors found so require authors to improve by re-checking	
Optional/General comments		

Comment [H4]: Before stating this have you compared to FAO/WHO for all your data within the recommendation

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:	Jaya Vejayan
Department, University & Country	Universiti Malaysia Pahang, Malaysia