



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_4945
Title of the Manuscript:	Colocasia esculenta [(L.) Schott] as an alternative energy source in animal nutrition
Type of the Article	Review

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	As it is, this manuscript cannot be accepted for publication because the words "taro cocoyam" together are confusing. In the international literature, the common name for <i>Colocasia esculenta</i> is taro and the common name for <i>Xanthosoma sagittifolium</i> is cocoyam. The two are very different species, although both are aroids, and they belong to two distinct genera, the former originating from Asia and the latter from South America. It is of utmost importance that throughout the text the distinction is clearly made between the two. Some statements and/or sentences do not contribute significantly to the quality of the text and should be omitted for concision and clarity. For example: Line 26: "Food being a basic requirement of life for the survival of man has become deficient." Also some references are too old, especially when they refer to economics. For example, line 97-98 (Obioha 1972)... taro was cheaper more than 40 years ago ?... what about today? Please cite a recent reference.	Corrected Corrected Deleted Corrected



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		Not applicable
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		Not applicable