

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_87250
Title of the Manuscript:	NUTRITIONAL CONTENTS OF TWO VARIETIES OF SWEET POTATOES (<i>Ipomoea batatas</i> (L.) Lam) CULTIVATED IN NORTH WEST, NIGERIA
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.journalejns.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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Materials and method Your title sounds like you work on potato tubers 2.1 like you have different samples; tuber stored in refrigerator and processed flour from the tuber. 2.2.1, 2.2.3 ... Be specific about 'sample' if its flour/powder or tuber and I think it should reflect in the title.</p> <p>AOAC method for proximate content determination is an established and well known method, you may spare the details.</p> <p>Kindly check through for words joined together and separate them by space, some are highlighted.</p> <p>Your reason for variation in result with those of other researchers should include different in processing method as many references you cited did not undergo many of the processes your sample undergo eg. References 10, 11 . Check your units for mineral elements and vitamins, why using per litre,..L. You work on solid (flour/tuber) and not liquid</p> <p>Check style of reference 6 with others Reference 26 is about potato leaf and not tuber/tuber powder.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>You carried out analysis on the powder which is totally different from the root due to several processes it had undergone such as soaking in hot water immersing in cold water, drying at a temperature as high as 105 oC and grinding. The composition and the structure would have been altered. Therefore your discussion should reflect such. Your discussion looks like you carried out analysis directly on the tubers. Differences will definitely exist between composition of the tuber and that of its flower both in quantity and quality.</p>	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Oluwatoyin A. Oladeji
Department, University & Country	Olusegun Agagu University of Science and Technology, Nigeria