

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Original Manuscript_ AJFRN_117809</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effects of Storage Materials and Conditions on Sensory Attributes of Sweet Potatoes (<i>Ipomoea batatas</i> (L) Lam)</b>
Type of the Article	

## Review Form 1.7

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This research is quite interesting and important for the scientific community. The data generated should be quite applicable for implementation in society.</li> <li>The title is quite suitable, but it would be better to mention the location where the research was conducted.</li> <li>The abstract is quite comprehensive. However, one question arises: why was the research conducted in two different years? The purpose of this is still not sufficiently explained in the abstract.</li> <li>The content of the "Pit Preparation for Sweet Potato Storage" section and the "Treatments and Experimental Design" section seems to overlap. It would be better if this could be corrected. Furthermore, the discussion section appears disjointed. It would be better if one set of data is fully discussed before moving on to the discussion of the next set of data. The impression after reading the discussion was that all data were described in sequence, followed by the discussion of each data from the beginning to the end, then followed by another discussion of the data from the beginning to the end. This was quite confusing and requires readers to go back and forth in the manuscript to understand the context.</li> <li>The discussion section still needs a lot of additions. Many discussion factors are overlooked or mentioned without explanation. It's unfortunate that such a good research idea is not adequately supported by sufficient explanations.</li> <li>Statistical data in the background section need to be supported by the latest references from reputable institutions, rather than obtained from other journal articles. There are quite a few references that are over 5 years old. Suggestions for sensory analysis references have already been provided in the review.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>The language seems to be conveyed in British English and is quite understandable. However, there are many errors in writing style that need to be addressed, such as extra spaces between words, the use of capital letters, and punctuation. Additionally, some paragraphs are too long and would be better if they could be broken into several paragraphs, where each paragraph only contains one idea.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The explanation regarding the details of the sensory test is not provided in the methodology or discussion. It is necessary to provide information on what standard parameters the panelists used during the test. For example, how does appearance (color) indicate the level of sweet potato quality decline? Is it possible that the sensory results do not reflect the decline in quality but rather the preference of the panelists? To eliminate doubts about procedural errors in this study, it is essential to provide sufficient explanation. This is a significant concern for me in considering the overall mark of this manuscript. However, I sincerely hope that what had occurred was merely a lack of explanation rather than a methodological error.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Oki Krisbianto</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universitas Ciputra Surabaya, Indonesia</b>