

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_128446
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Storage Time on Acridity of Irradiated Cocoyam Corms
Type of the Article	Short Research Articles

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: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The importance of this research is to find out the influence of storage methods on the acidity of Cocoyam. Because cocoyam is one of the alternative food sources, for human food needs. Therefore, this research is very important to be carried out.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of this research is suitable, because it is simple and xylophone is understood by the readers	
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.	The abstract of this article is not comprehensive, because it has not explained the main purpose of the research, the design of the study (place and time of the research), and the methodology has not been well explained.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript of this article has met the scientific principles, but needs some revisions and improvements	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references used are inadequate, because of the 18 references there are 16 references under 2020, there are even 4 references in 2014. I also suggest adding a reference to the storage method.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Regarding the quality of the English used, it is standard and suitable for communicating scientific research.	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The keyword consists of only 3 words 2. Do not use letters according to the template (Arial) 3. At the end of the paragraph, there is no explanation of the novelty and the main purpose of the research at the end of the paragraph 4. In each table of research results, there should be a discussion related to the research results 5. Writing a reference list must have a semicolon (,) that limits between one name and another, as well as the use of symbols (&), not (and). 	

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:	Ir. Syamsul Rahman
Department, University & Country	Universitas Islam Makassar, Indonesian