



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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Introduction: clear and appropriated. - Sample Collection: a description in more details about your samples is welcome. Did you a botanical classification your samples ? When did you the collection your samples? and sampling criteria are necessary. How you did the botanical classification ? different species ? - Method for Analysis: If you have other molecules absorbing also in 470nm, how can you affirm that you measuring only carotenoids? - You need a validation of your measurement (figures of merit) your analytical procedure. - Where is the "statistic" your work ? - Your figures must be better presented/worked. - Table 1. standard deviation of your concentrations ? - Figure 1: unnecessary - Results and discussion: must be more argumentative and to connect your results. - Conclusion: modest. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Marcelo Barcellos da Rosa
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Santa Maria, Brazil