

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 feedback here)
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.	The study explores enzymatic activities in Dioscorea bulbifera bulbils, revealing distinct metabolic profiles influenced by genetic and environmental factors. Key enzymes, such as acid phosphatase, are identified, with potential applications in agriculture and biotechnology.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Enzymatic activity profiles at different stages of the development of bulbils from "Dougou-won" and "Won-kpia," two varieties of Dioscorea bulbifera	
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.	very brief The purpose, place of study, methods of work, results and conclusions must be taken into account in brief.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	The subject of the manuscript is important and influential. The writing style and scientific approach are very good. With some modifications, this manuscript could be excellent for publication.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Need some modifications	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Hassan Nima Habib
Department, University & Country	University of Basrah, Iraq