

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCS_128444
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Gamma irradiation and Storage Time on the Sprouting of Cocoyam Corms
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>

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 subject is very relevant, especially in postharvest technology where different radiations are being exposed to crops. Henceforth, this could give prior knowledge to farmers or food processors during the storage stage in postharvest handlings.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No Impact of Gamma Irradiation and Storage Duration on Cocoyam Corm Sprouting	
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.	A brief introduction and the importance of the topic are lacking in the abstract.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically correct.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions for additional references, please mention them in the review form.	None	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, but major revision must be done on it.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ A brief introduction and the importance of the topic are lacking in the abstract. ✓ The introduction section of the paper discusses the cocoyam crop and its importance and as well introduces irradiation and its contribution to postharvest technology. However, the work lacks a detailed discussion of previous works relating to the topic. Has radiation strategy been used before? What method was used before? What type of radiation has been used before (gamma, beta, etc.)? What is the research gap in the previous studies? ✓ There are no images to support "Materials and Methods", the author must provide some images. ✓ Different doses of gamma-ray were used in the study, however, the results were compared with "Control", what is control? What are the conditions of the "Control"? 	

Review Form 3

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ What are the experimental conditions considered in this work? ✓ “The corms were carefully examined every week...” How was the examination done? What was recorded (weight or number of sprout yam)? ✓ What is the target audience in this work? Why is this work relevant to them in terms of practicality? ✓ “the rate of cocoyam sprouting during storage...” how was the rate calculated? Any mathematical formula to support it? ✓ “<i>Feng et al. (2016) further reported that these sprout-regulators are disrupted by the energy of agitation associated with gamma irradiation</i>” and “<i>The results in the study obtained agreed with the findings of Adeyanju et al. (2019) for Colocasia species and Amadi et al. (2018) for Xanthosoma species</i>” indicate that the same work has been done in the previous works, and results are the same, this work just confirmed the results in previous scientific findings. Henceforth, what is the novelty of this work, and what is so different to fill a gap in the previous studies? ✓ The article is full of grammatical errors from the Abstract to the conclusion. Hence, the whole article should be proofread or grammatical software like Grammarly. Some of these errors are <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Absract” instead of “Abstract” • “Nigeria cultivar were...” instead of “Nigeria cultivars were...” • “cocoyam are known...” instead of “cocoyam is known ...” • “vigour these...” instead of “vigour of these ...” • “The results of the studyS ...” instead of “The results of the study...” • “sprouted than...” instead of “sprouted more than...” • “dose dependent ...” instead of “dose-dependent ...” • “improve on the storability ...” instead of “improve the storability ...” • “inhibiting sprouting of ...” instead of “inhibiting the sprouting of ...” • “Key words ...” instead of “Keywords ...” • “poor quality ...” instead of “poor-quality ...” • “that bringing food ...” instead of “that brings food ...” • “famers ...” instead of “farmers ...” • “non application ...” instead of “non-application ...” • “smaller scale cocoyam are ...” instead of “smaller scale cocoyam is ...” • “vigour of at using RSM ...” instead of “vigour of using RSM ...” • “acridity ...” instead of “acidity ...” • “results of effect ...” instead of “results of the effect” • “regression coefficients obtained for is ...” instead of “regression coefficients obtained for are ...” • “The results in the study ...” instead of “The results of the study” 	
--	---	--

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Osei Seth
Department, University & Country	University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, China