

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIB_12540
Title of the Manuscript:	PROXIMATE AND MINERAL COMPOSITION OF THE STEM AND LEAF OF CNIDOSCOLUS ACONITIFOLIUS
Type of the 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>

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.	Significant study has carried out on species <i>Cnidosculus aconitifolius</i> . Medicinal uses may also be reflected in introduction. Introduction should be improved.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	
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.	No, need an improvement and comprehensive and language should be improved. " Authors name should be given along with botanical names. <i>Cnidosculus aconitifolius</i> is a shrub or small tree." At introduction <i>Cnidosculus aconitifolius</i> , commonly called chaya or tree sponnach is widely consumed in the southern part of Nigeria as vegetables. It should be spinach.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and	Need improvement	

technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are not up to mark as per guidelines of Journal.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Need improvement	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Sidharth Tiwari
Department, University & Country	University of Allahabad, India