

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Food Science Journal |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AFSJ_100150 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | EFFECT OF ANNEALING, HEAT MOISTURE TREATMENT AND CITRIC ACID MODIFICATIONS ON THE CHEMICAL COMPOSITION, X-RAY DIFFRACTION PATTERN AND SCANNING MORPHOLOGY OF STARCHES FROM COCOYAM (COLOCASIA ESCULENTA AND XANTHOSOMA SAGITTIFOLIUM) |
| Type of the Article | Research |

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://www.journalafsj.com/index.php/AFSJ/editorial-policy>

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p> | <p>Yes, but the methodologies are not scientifically reported as indicated in the comments. There is need for thorough revision of the methodologies.</p> <p>The title of the article is too long. Chemical Modifications and Properties of Starches from Cocoyam Cultivars</p> <p>Abstract is moderately good</p> <p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate</p> <p>The manuscript is a true representation of a scientific research. However, manuscript does not exhibit good scientific report's style. There are missing information on X-ray diffractograms</p> <p>The references are sufficient, but more recent ones may have been cited. There are uncited sentences, which have been indicated as comment on the manuscript directly.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>The English quality is generally poor. Comments have been made directly on the manuscript on some of the grammatical errors noticed.</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>The author(s) should have studied the FTIR patterns of the samples to ascertain the success of the modification processes adopted in the study.</p> | |

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) |
|--|--|---|
| <p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p> | <p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p> | |

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | Abraham Olasupo Oladebeye |
| Department, University & Country | University of Medical Sciences, Nigeria |