



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCS_37112
Title of the Manuscript:	QUANTITATIVE DETERMINATION OF SUGARS IN THREE VARIETIES OF CASSAVA PULP
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 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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The topic of this paper is relevant to this journal. The manuscript studied the quantitative determination of sugars in three varieties of cassava pulp. The manuscript is a good experimental work. Following are some comments to improve your paper: • The objectives are not well defined in the abstract; The aim of your research in abstract section is “Investigating the sugar content in cassava tuber” IS TECHNICAL work AND NOT SCIENTIFIC. Please explain how this study advances our knowledge in this domain...Complete the abstract with the practical implications of your findings. • Some of the statements in the introduction section were made without supporting references. • The methodology of this study must be original • Figures 1 and 2 where is the legend of the green curve? • Please check the manuscript carefully for the	- Correction has been effected. - References has been added to such statements - The legend has been captured - Point noted



SDI Review Form 1.6

	correction of some unclear sentences .. For these reasons, I recommend minor revisions	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		