

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">European Journal of Nutrition &amp; Food Safety</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_83274
Title of the Manuscript:	PROXIMATE AND MINERAL COMPOSITION OF AERIAL POTATO (DIOSCOREA BULBIFERA LINN) AFTER USING DIFFERENT FERMENTATION METHODS
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://www.journalejnfs.com/index.php/EJNFS/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In Material and Methods, the different fermentation are missing.</li> <li>- Table 4 is not well formatted !!</li> <li>- Always in Table 4, what means a, b, c ... h as notes ? (same for Table 5 and 6)</li> <li>- "The observed increase in the ash content (Table 4 – 6) due" and following, in results and discussion. The Tables 4-6 are the Mineral composition .... there is no ash, fat or else things.</li> </ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is two time the same sentence in the introduction, but not with the same references !!! ("<i>Dioscorea bulbifera</i> preparation has been used for memory enhancement, anti-aging, constipation and fever (Odeghe <i>et al</i>, 2020), and has also been used as an infusion to apply to cuts and sores due to its high composition of the tannin that is used to hasten healing of wounds in a flamed membrane (Ikiriza <i>et al.</i>, 2019).")</li> <li>- In results and discussion, what are the criteria chosen in table 1 to 3 (for example Water) ?</li> <li>- How the authors explains the increase of Ca and Mg ? (OK an explanation is written later in manuscript)</li> <li>- Why the supernatant was discarded and not included in the analysis ? Please write a sentence instead of a reference.</li> </ul>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- For me, the conclusion is a little too short.</li> <li>- The introduction is good.</li> <li>- The overall is that there is a basic analysis of the results.</li> </ul>	

### 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:	Gilles OLIVE
Department, University & Country	Belgium