



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_54567
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of the suitability of different cassava varieties for gari and fufu flour production in Liberia
Type of the 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	Duration of study is not mentioned during discussion reference no of figures and table no is not mentioned There is too much detail of procedures or protocols .few lines are ok with reference and formula if needed	
Minor REVISION comments	Conflict of interest among authors is not declared Ethical concern is not taken from ethical review committee	
Optional/General comments	Very nice very informative well written well explained and nicely concluded article	

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:	Nain Taara Bukhari
Department, University & Country	Aga Khan University Hospital, Pakistan