

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_126341
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutritional quality of 'Tchonron' sauce made from Adenia cissampelides and Hibiscus asper leaves cooked with and without potash
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript highlights are valuable for the scientific community as it educates individuals first to have knowledge about increased utilization of leaves as a food product and the nutritional benefits that is gain from their consumption. It is valuable for public health and food security in regions that experience malnutrition, providing a way to combat that and providing the better method of food preparation	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is suitable. Can also be improved by adding "cultural" to the title, so readers can know it is a food with a specific region (Nutritional quality of 'Tchonron,' a cultural sauce made from <i>Adenia cissampelides</i> and <i>Hibiscus asper</i> leaves cooked with and without potash)	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract was well written. I do not have further addition.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, they were structured and organized. The flow chat should be corrected. With or without potash as both flowcharts currently shows the same pattern. The objective of the study should be written as the last sentence in the introduction.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study is scientifically robust as it contains standard methods of analysis, detailing the steps in making the samples as well as how the analysis were conducted. The study provides detailed experimental procedures for preparing 'Tchonron' sauce and measures key nutritional components, including minerals, fiber, vitamins, and fatty acids, making the findings reliable and reproducible. Statistical analysis further supports the results by highlighting significant differences between samples, reinforcing the accuracy of conclusions drawn.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The reference should follow a pattern, either abbreviating the journal names or writing it in full. Summarily there should be uniformity in whatever pattern is chosen	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language used is suitable. However, there are some sections with a mix of French and English. Especially in the tables. Lipids – "Lipides"	
Optional/General comments	Overall, the research and study are a good one.	

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:	Chidimma Linda Ifeh
Department, University & Country	Montana State University, United States