



SDI Review Form 1.6

	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2015_AJEA_18087
Title of the Manuscript:	Phytochemical constituents in leaves of 14 breeding lines of cassava (<i>Manihotesculenta</i> Crantz)
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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>The phytochemical methods used for the determination of the content of these natural products are quantitative which made the study rather weak. However, the following comments if acted on by the authors may help to improve the scientific quality of their manuscript.</p> <p>The titled should be modified to be: Phytochemical constituents and antioxidant activities of 14 breeding lines of cassava (<i>Manihot esculenta</i> Crantz).</p> <p>In page 3, L129, the reference: Chang et al. (2002) is not in the reference section.</p> <p>A major challenge to the use of DPPH assay alone in the determination of antioxidant activity of a sample is that DPPH is both a radical probe and oxidant. DPPH also is decolorized by reducing agents as well as H transfer, which also contributes to inaccurate interpretations of antioxidant activity. Better measurements for antioxidant assays are oxygen radical absorbance capacity (ORAC) assay or by total radical-trapping antioxidant parameter (TRAP), which actually measures the antioxidant activity of compounds in vitro under conditions that are closer to physiological conditions.</p> <p>If the authors had even combined the DPPH assays with other assays utilizing SET Reaction mechanism such as: Ferric antioxidant reducing power, ABTS, etc, it would have been better. Thus determining antioxidant activity of the cassava leaves using DPPH assay alone is not sufficient.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Title has been modified as recommended by reviewer. 2. All references have been updated as requested by reviewer. 3. All necessary corrections have been made.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>MOFA, 2010 was cited in text in L35-36 but not in reference section.</p> <p>The reference "FAO/WHO, 1973 is old and should be replaced with newer ones.</p> <p>This statement in L49-50 "Cassava leaves also contain moderate levels of phytochemicals that are important as natural antioxidant components of plant food products" should be supported with a reference.</p> <p>Renaud et al., 1998 was cited in text in L58 but not in reference section.</p> <p>Temple, 2000 was cited in text but not in reference section.</p> <p>Andersen, 2006 was cited in text but not seen in reference section.</p> <p>Andersen and Jordheim (2006) were cited in the text but not seen in the reference section.</p> <p>Chaudiere and Ferrari-Iliou 1999 was cited in text in L60but not seen in the reference section.</p> <p>Benzie (2003) was cited in text in L62 but not found in the reference section.</p> <p>In L72, Nassar, 2010 was cited in text bt not in reference section.</p> <p>In L96, you don't start a sentence with an number "100 ml.</p> <p>Kujala et al., 2000 was cited in text in L119 but not in reference section.</p> <p>In L155, use of Duncan Multiple Range Test is no longer acceptable. Even Duncan himself has acknowledged the errors in his model. Authors should have used New Duncan Multiple Range Test instead for their mean separation.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		