



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_48485
Title of the Manuscript:	Quantitative Analysis of Total Carotenoids in some Vegetables Consumed in Akwa Ibom State, 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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>Details of the methods used is not necessary for the abstract.</p> <p>The literature review is sufficient, however, the author should compare the results of their studies with previous similar works.</p>	The results of the studies have been compared to previous similar works, which has shown similarity and novelty.
Minor REVISION comments	Author should do a grammatical check on the paper.	Grammatical check has been done on the paper.
Optional/General comments	The work will be robust if the author can check for phenolic contents of the extract and thereby check for any relationship between the carotenoid content and the phenolic content.	

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)	The manuscript has been corrected inline with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.