

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFRN_119186
Title of the Manuscript:	ISOLATION AND IDENTIFICATION OF PATHOGENS ASSOCIATED WITH POSTHARVEST WHITE YAM (<i>Dioscorea rotundata</i> L) TUBER ROT
Type of the Article	

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, the manuscript provides crucial insights into pathogens causing postharvest rot in white yam tuber, aiding food security and economic stability in yam- producing areas Yes, the current title is suitable as it accurately reflects the study's focus. The abstract is comprehensive, summarizing the study's objectives, methods, key findings and significance effectively. Yes, the manuscript's structure with clear subsections for each part of the study, ensures a logical flow and readability. The manuscript is scientifically sound, employing rigorous methods and statistical analysis to support its findings. The references are sufficient and relevant, though including more recent studies from the past five years would enhance the manuscript's currency. <p>Include suitable photos and consider adding more recent references to ensure the study is contextualized within the latest research developments in the field.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The English quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication, but it could benefit from some revisions for conciseness. Some sections are overly verbose, particularly in the detailed descriptions of results and rot severity (after Table 3 and sections 3) contain repetitive and detailed numerical data that could be summarized more succinctly.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Photos can be included Graphs can be used</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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:	Kousalya Shanmugam
Department, University & Country	Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, India