



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		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This paper presented very interesting pilot study on quantitative determination of sugars in three varieties of cassava pulp. The authors concluded in his study that Reducing sugar and sucrose are important sugars in cassava, which serves as the immediate product of photosynthesis and the fundamental requisite for the synthesis of sucrose. Results from this finding, will be used to enlighten farm extension workers on the requirement for improved photosynthetic process, as a way to build starch yield in the underlying foundations of cassava. The paper is written very carefully and it is a well written paper. The reviewer recommends this paper for acceptance	-



SDI Review Form 1.6

	with the following change. 1. There are many irregularities in English in this paper, so it should be revised seriously. 2. Discussion part is too weak, this should be revised 3. In general, figures are poorly and not well presented and the figure caption does not provide sufficient information. This should be revised. 4. Please follow the journal requirement “guide for authors, Figure, tables, references,...” 5. Conclusion section It is too bulky. Make it concise form possibly with some numerical results. 6. Conclusions must be comprehensive and not written like a report. It's very important if you added some references of 2016-2017.	- Correction will be done - More information to support the findings has been added - Corrections has been made with regards to that. - It has been summarized. - Some of the references has been added.
--	---	--