

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCS_96840
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutritional and mineral compositions of Tiger nut (Cyperus Esculentus) tubers from different ecotypes in Niger.
Type of the Article	Short Research Article

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.journalajrcs.com/index.php/AJRCS/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. The manuscript presents important information, mainly for needy communities that have difficulties in accessing food. The species under study is an excellent alternative for the population with little purchasing power. 2. Yes. 3. The abstract needs to present more objective conclusions. Check the manuscript for recommendations for changes. 4. I always recommend building the document with just one item containing 'Results and Discussion'. However, there is no harm to the article when it is well presented. 5. The manuscript is scientifically correct, as it presents consistent analyzes of the purpose of the study, which needs to be made clearer at the end of the 'Introduction'. An error that presented the article is to indicate in which 'general climatic conditions by place that the working materials were collected'. 6. References for the last 10 years are 59%. Ideally, it should be close to 70%. However, the authors cited to corroborate the article are appropriate. Additional suggestions are in the body of the manuscript. I recommend consulting the recommendations in detail.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
Optional/General comments	See attached manuscript. There are many guidelines in detail to add and delete.	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	José Carlos Fialho de Resende
Department, University & Country	Brazil