

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_125849
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of fertilizer on the colour and starch properties of yam (<i>Dioscorea spp</i>) tuber
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 use of fertilizer and changes in biochemical properties spoke about the quality of the paper. The color indices of the tuber flesh of the species by the use of fertilizer will change, and the farmers should help them. By this research, the good starch production benefitted a lot to do in the scientific community with a minor fertilizer change.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it suite better, but have the possibility to use differently.	
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.	No. I think it is perfect.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, Appropriate sections were in 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.	Dealing with the tuber crop research and the use of starch and its biochemical properties. For higher crop productivity, from an economic point of view, we shall use chemical fertilizer in an appropriate proportion, which results in higher tubers with well-distinguished characters. Here, the paper underlined it.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The number of references is good, but they are somewhat outdated. Providing more recent references would help to highlight the latest scientific developments and explanations.	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes, but the author can improve more.	
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:	Anju Prakasan Sujatha
Department, University & Country	University of Kerala, India