

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_122567
Title of the Manuscript:	Enzymatic activity profiles at different stage of development of bulbils from “Dougou-won” and “Won-kpia”, two varieties of Dioscorea bulbifera
Type of the 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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her
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.	Because This study investigates the enzymatic activities of polyphenoloxidase (PPO), peroxidase (POD), acid phosphatase, α -D-glycosidase, β -glycosidase, invertase, α -amylase, inulase and cellulase in bulbils of "Dougou-won" and "Won-kpia",. . were recorded highest index score and fell into different complex, hence used as parents for getting good combinations for future hybridization programmes.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the articles is very suitable.	
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.	Yes , the abstract of the article is comprehensive	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes , subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.	
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.	Because it is painful with all the contents of the article and contains modern sources that benefit society . the researcher relied on the chronology of the sources .	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Yes , the references are sufficient and recent.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes , the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments	Very good	

[Review Form 3](#)

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:	Bushra Mahmood Alwan
Department, University & Country	University of Baghdad, Iraq