SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.5

PART A:

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	**MS: 2012/AJEA/1082**
Title of the Manuscript:	***EVALUATION OF SELECTED PHYTOCHEMICALS AND BIOACTIVE COMPONENTS IN FLUTED PUMPKIN (Telfairia Occidentalis) AND AMARANTH (Amaranthus caudatus) LEAVES***
Manuscript received on (Date)	
Review comment submitted (Date)	

SDI Review Form 1.5

PART B: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment** *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part and write here 'Corrected'/ if not agreed, give suitable justifications)*
General comment:	This manuscript can be improved by reducing the number of tables and general comments about the phytochemicals in the Results section before providing the results. The results should be discussed first followed by discussion/ interpretation and not the other way.	'Corrected'
Specific comments:	Expressing the data in mg/ml makes it difficult to compare with literature values. Data should be presented in mg or µg/g instead. Sentence structure needs improvement (see detail comments)	'Corrected'
Title and abstract	ok	
Introduction	A Google Scholar search on *Amaranthus caudatus leaves phenolics and antioxidants* yields 118 hits indicating that many investigation on similar topic exist, for example, Journal of Medicinal Plants Research Vol. 3(8), pp. 608-612, August, 2009	'Corrected' The write-up has been greatly improved to accommodate these corrections.
Review of literature (Heading may differ in the case of review paper)	Same as above	
Materials & methods (Heading may differ in the case of review paper)	Phenolic acid should have been expressed in gallic acid equivalents (GAE) to remove ambiguity with tannin content where tannic acid is generally used as standard.	'Corrected'
Results & discussion (Heading may differ in the case of review paper)	The use of the superscript is ambiguous; are different letters in a row or column different? It appears to be haphazard. The author/s should be precise in using the statistical analysis.	'Corrected'
Conclusion	ok	
References	Some references have spelling errors, for example, Cardador Martinez, (line 362)	'Corrected'

SDI Review Form 1.5

Lines 8-11-restructure sentence as follows: The flour samples were separately soaked in ethanol and distilled water, filtered and rotary evaporated to obtain the respective aqueous (AECT) and ethanolic (EECT) concentrates.
Lines 19-20- delete “found to be”
Line 28- replace “have been undertaken with the aims of” by “aims at”
Lines 30-31-replace “to which many infectious microorganisms have become resistant” by “that induce antimicrobial resistance”

Lines 48-50; and 58-62-provide references for composition of *Telfaria* and *Amaranthus*
Line 89-delete the second “were”
Lines 89-94- replace “Fifty grams (50g) of *Telfairia occidentalis* leaf flour” by “Leaf flours (50 g) were soaked in ethanol or distilled water (500 ml) for 24 h, filtered (provide the type of filter used) and concentrated with a rotary evaporator (provide time and temperature for evaporation) to obtain aqueous (AECT) and ethanolic (EECT) concentrated leaf extracts.”

Line 102-provide the equipment name (spectrophotometer) used for monitoring absorbance.

Line 109 and beyond- “catteic” does the author/s mean “caffeic”?