



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 Akwalbom 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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comment

	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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Write the common names of the vegetables used in the study before the scientific names in the abstract. 2. The binomial name in the manuscript <i>Veroniaamygdalina</i> is wrongly spelt throughout the manuscript. Correct it to <i>Vernoniaamygdalina</i>. 3. Change 4oC to 4°C in line 83. 4. Section 2.2 should not read method of analysis instead it should read carotenoid determination. 5. There should be a section 2.3 titled data analysis which should indicate the statistical tool used to analyze your data. Since you claimed you collected your data in triplicates, did you use ANOVA, chi-square, T-test etc to analyze your data? 6. Subject Table 1 to T-test analysis to determine significant difference in the quantity of carotenoid between treatments. 7. Figures 1 and 2 are repetitions. They convey the same meaning with the results in Table 1. Please, remove them from the manuscript. 8. Figure 3 has no basis in the manuscript. It has no significance and no meaning based on the objectives of the research. It is just hanging. Please, remove it. 9. The Beer lamberts law states that the absorbance through a sample is directly proportional to the concentration in the sample. Therefore, absorbance is proportional to concentration. It is an error separating absorbance and concentration under the spectrophotometric method. 10. Arrange the manuscript according to the journal specifications. 11. Make compulsory grammatical corrections throughout the entire manuscript. 12. The manuscript does not have enough data to provide knowledge to readers. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Common names of the vegetables used is written before the scientific names in the abstract. 2. <i>Veronia amygdalina</i> is corrected to <i>Vernonia amygdalina</i> throughout the manuscript. 3. 4oC has been changed to 4°C in line 83. 4. Section 2.2 has been changed to carotenoid determination 5. Section 2.3 with title Data Analysis has been added. 6. Table 1 has been subjected to T-test and the result included under section 2.3. 7. Figure 1 and 2 have been removed. 8. Although the research seeks to quantify carotenoid in vegetables, some samples had deep coloured counterpart while others had only green vegetables without bright coloured counterpart which lead to the comparison. This, gave rise to figure 3 but however hasbeen removed. 9. The quantification was also done according to Harbone JB, 1973 and this has been added to the manuscript. 10. The manuscript has been arranged according to the journal specifications. 11. Grammatical corrections has been made throughout the manuscript.
Minor REVISION comments	Authors need to improve on the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments	Information on the subject matter is poor. There is need for serious improvement.	

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>	The manuscript has been revised and corrected as recommended by the reviewers.