

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_117509
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploring Consumer Preferences and Nutritional Value: A Study on Wild vs. Farmed African Giant Rat Meat (<i>Cricetomys gambianus</i>) in Mampong Ashanti of Ghana
Type of the Article	Original Research 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> <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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1) The manuscript titled "Exploring Consumer Preferences and Nutritional Value: A Study on Wild vs. Farmed African Giant Rat Meat (<i>Cricetomys gambianus</i>) in Mampong Ashanti of Ghana" is important for the scientific community due to its detailed investigation into consumer behavior, nutritional analysis, and sensory attributes of African giant rat meat. This study provides valuable insights into wildlife consumption, domestication, and food preferences in Ghana, contributing to the fields of wildlife management, agriculture, and nutrition.</p> <p>2) The title of the article effectively communicates the main focus of the study. An alternative title could be "Comparative Analysis of Consumer Preferences and Nutritional Composition of Wild and Farmed African Giant Rat Meat in Ghana."</p> <p>3) The abstract of the article appears comprehensive, summarizing the research problem, methodology, key findings, and implications effectively. However, there might be room for improvement in terms of succinctness and clarity to better capture the essence of the study.</p> <p>4) The subsections and structure of the manuscript appear appropriate but could benefit from further refinement for better organization and flow. Ensuring a clear and logical progression from introduction to methodology, results, discussion, and conclusion will enhance readability.</p> <p>5) The manuscript appears scientifically correct based on the information provided. However, additional details regarding the methodology and statistical analysis would be necessary to fully assess its scientific rigor.</p> <p>6) The references seem adequate, but it's essential to ensure that they are recent and relevant to the topic. Including recent studies on wildlife consumption, nutritional analysis, and consumer behavior would strengthen the manuscript's background and contextualization. Some suggested additions could include recent publications on wildlife conservation, food security, and consumer studies in Africa.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>"The article demonstrates a suitable level of language and English quality for scholarly communication, with a formal tone and appropriate technical vocabulary. However, some grammatical improvements and clarity enhancements would strengthen its effectiveness as a research publication."</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>OVER ALL GOOD CONSIDER FOR THE PUBLICATION AFTER THE GIVEN MODIFICATION</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:	A. Varadaraj
Department, University & Country	School of Business, Alliance University, India