

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFRN_125671
Title of the Manuscript:	Ethno-Botanical Study of Water Yam (<i>Dioscorea alata</i> L.) Tubers in Storage in the South Eastern Nigeria
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 <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 is important because it has stated clearly how important is the water yam in the study area not just as a source of energy but also as employment and medicinal to diabetic patients.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Not quite suitable. Can it read as " ANALYSIS OF THE PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION OF WATER YAM (Dioscorea alata) in the South-Eastern Nigeria	
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 is well written as it has captured the most important points	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Very appropriate	
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.	It is scientifically robust in the sense that it has given insight on how, where, when and who are involved in the cultivation of the crop, meaning it can be replicate/ domesticated in other parts of the world where is it not known using the knowledge from this manuscript.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	YES,	
Minor REVISION comments	YES	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Zuwaira Haruna Mohammed
Department, University & Country	University of Maiduguri, Nigeria