

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_121003
Title of the Manuscript:	NUTRIENTS COMPOSITION AND PHYTOCHEMICAL PROPERTIES OF SELECTED SPICES COMMONLY CONSUMED IN NIGERIA
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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 provides valuable insights into the nutrient composition and phytochemical properties of commonly consumed spices in Nigeria, contributing to the understanding of their potential health benefits and applications. The detailed analysis of proximate composition, mineral content, and phytochemical properties highlights the significance of these spices in both traditional and modern contexts. Addressing the minor corrections identified will enhance the clarity and precision of the data presentation, further solidifying the manuscript's contribution to the scientific community.	Noted
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title "NUTRIENTS COMPOSITION AND PHYTOCHEMICAL PROPERTIES OF SELECTED SPICES COMMONLY CONSUMED IN NIGERIA" is generally clear and informative, but it can be slightly revised for better clarity and conciseness. suggested alternative title: NUTRITIONAL AND PHYTOCHEMICAL PROFILE OF COMMONLY CONSUMED SPICES IN NIGERIA	Title has been revised
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.	<p>The abstract of the article is generally comprehensive, summarizing the key findings of the study. However, a few corrections are needed to improve clarity. Specifically:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>Briefly state the methods you used to determine the phytochemical properties of the selected spices in your abstract under "materials and methods."</li><li>The description of the phytochemical properties in the abstract is somewhat missing and lacks specific details. It would be helpful to include more quantitative data or specific comparisons to give readers a clearer understanding of the findings. For example, mention the actual amounts or relative concentrations of alkaloids, flavonoids, and polyphenols in turmeric compared to the other spices.</li><li>The conclusion should directly reflect the specific findings presented in the results. It would be beneficial to explicitly mention how the high nutrient and/or phytochemical content of the spices supports their use in medicine and as food supplements. This makes the conclusion more directly tied to the data provided.</li></ol>	<p>Effected revision</p> <p>Revision made</p> <p>Noted</p>
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and overall structure of the manuscript are appropriate and effectively organized. The logical flow of information supports the clarity and readability of the manuscript.	
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 manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness through its thorough analysis of nutrient composition and phytochemical properties of selected spices. The use of appropriate analytical techniques and detailed methodology supports the reliability of the data presented. The findings are well-supported and contribute valuable insights into the nutritional and medicinal potential of these spices. Overall, the manuscript adheres to scientific standards and offers meaningful contributions to the field of food science and nutrition.	Noted
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references cited in the manuscript are both recent and sufficient for the study. The inclusion of current and relevant literature supports the research and situates it within the context of recent developments in the field. No additional references are necessary.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the manuscript need improvement for suitable scholarly communication. There are several grammatical errors and inconsistencies that should be addressed:  1. On page 2, Zingiberofficinale, Zingiberaceae, Myristicafragrans, and Piper guineense should be italicized because they are scientific names.  2. There are inconsistencies in the spelling of "flavor" and "flavour" within the manuscript (for example, page 1-2). Also, "min." and "minutes" appear in the Materials and Methods section (page 4). To maintain consistency, please choose one spelling or form and use it consistently throughout the entire manuscript.  3. The sentence "In Nigeria it is commonly cultivated within the middle belt states and is powder fastly becoming a household kitchen item in the country (7)" on page 2 contains grammatical errors and awkward phrasing. A revised version could be: "In Nigeria, it is commonly cultivated in the Middle Belt states and is quickly becoming a staple item in household kitchens across the country (7)."  4. It is recommended that the manuscript be reviewed and proofread by someone with strong English language skills to address these issues and improve overall readability.	
Optional/General comments	1. Numerical values should have a space between the number and the unit of measurement to adhere to standard scientific conventions. For example, "13.3mg/100g" should be corrected to "13.3 mg/100 g". An exception is made for percentages, which should not have a space (e.g., "14.41%"). Please ensure that these corrections are made consistently throughout the manuscript as these errors appear multiple times.  2. Tables 1-3 and Table 5 do not include units of measurement for the data presented. For clarity and to ensure accurate interpretation of the results, please add the appropriate units of measurement to each table. This will provide essential context and make the data more comprehensible.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	