

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes, the article deals towards the study to investigate consumer preference, sensory attributes, proximate composition, and acceptability of meats from African Giant Rat of Ghana. The author investigates and concludes that giant African rats raised on farms is safer, and have high protein content, suitable for human eating's.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title 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 suitable for the article as it adequately investigates the consumer preference towards the consumption of the African Rat Giants.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract is comprehensive enough to cover the details of the paper.</p> <p>4. Yes, they all are properly structured and well-prepared. The author maintained the structured flow.</p> <p>5. Yes, the work provides meaningful outcomes which are helpful to the society and research community to enhance their knowledge.</p> <p>6. It is adequately cited. At one place require citation. They are marked in the form of comment.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Minor grammatical corrections are required mentioned in comment.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Deepak Agrawal
Department, University & Country	Lal Bahadur Shastri Institute of Management, Devi Ahilya University, India