

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFRN_114859
Title of the Manuscript:	Total iron and extractable iron content of ten indigenous vegetables in Ghana
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, this manuscript is important for a no. of scientific reasons as it explores the iron content of various locally available vegetarian produce which will help poor people in community determining the best source of iron with their starchy main dishes.</p> <p>No, I feel the title of the manuscript should be something like, “ A study to determine the total iron and extractable iron content available in the indigenous vegetable leaves of Ghana or Nutritional analysis of indigenous Ghanaian vegetables: total iron and extractable iron content” as it provides a weightage to the point which author wants to put across.</p> <p>The abstract I would say is a little misleading as aim and the title of the research talks about importance of vegetables and then replacing the meats in poor people's diet but later on the methodology, result and conclusion talk about iron content of vegetable leaves. Also I feel that author should mention Statistical method in methodology and mention p value in results which shows greater impact and quality to the manuscript.</p> <p>Overall, the manuscript follows a logical structure, with each subsection addressing specific aspects of the study in a clear and organized manner.</p> <p>As mentioned above there is a serious lack of evidence to support the methods as well as formulas used for the determination of iron content of leaves in the article. No reference studies are mentioned which can support the materials and method used as well as the methods of analysis used for the determination of Total Iron and Extractable Iron Content of the vegetable leaves. Also only determining the iron content of vegetables will not help, one should also focus on anti-nutritional factors present in the vegetables like oxalates, phytates etc.</p> <p>It will be recommended to add tables alongside graphs for better display of the results. Also apply statistical tools to graph also to show significance. Also author can work on the bioavailability of iron present in the 10 leafy vegetables which will make the study more authentic.</p>	<p>We prefer “A study to determine the total iron and extractable iron content available in ten indigenous vegetables of Ghana” as the article's title.</p> <p>Meat was mentioned in the abstract as part of the background of the study which is a normal source of iron in the diet of middle-income and economic class in Ghana. Statistical methods have been mentioned and explained in the text. P-value has been included and discussed as well in the revised manuscript.</p> <p>Bioavailability is the same as the extractability of the iron which we have mentioned earlier in our study.</p> <p>Methods used to determine the total iron and extractable iron were mentioned under the methodology in the text (page 3).</p>
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>There is a need to revise the quality of English in the article as it can be a little rough and patchy in between and need of necessary paragraph breaking and pauses.</p>	<p>English language usage has been revised at the latest.</p>
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	NOT APPLICABLE