



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/IJBcRR/2017
Title of the Manuscript:	Classification of Some Wild Yam Species Based on Their Chemical Composition

General guideline: Reviewers are requested to follow these guidelines during review: (Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper / case reports)

- Introduction (Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?)
- Materials & methods (Kindly comment on the suitability of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods should be provided to allow peers to evaluate and/or replicate the work)
- Results & discussion (Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)
- Conclusion (Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only)
- Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?
- This form has total 9 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 and write here 'Corrected' / if not agreed, give suitable justifications)
<u>COMPULSORYREVISION</u> comments	Concerning the manuscript MS: 2012/IJBcRR/2017, the introduction is short and in some cases more information should be included. In page 1, lines 11-12: "The yam is also used for other purposes as food in Africa including wild yams are used in traditional medicine for their therapeutic properties. They are also used because of their toxic properties (Miege, 1977)". Some examples of their use in traditional medicine and their use due their toxic properties should be included. In my opinion, some descriptions of material and methods section should be improved. The methods are poorly described and in some cases ambiguously. Some references	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	are not easily available such as Multon (1991) and there is no description for the method used for cellulose content, only the reference in cited. A description of the preparation of the plant material after be collected should be included. The amount of plant material collected and the number of individuals used for each species should be informed. For the authors, what is the difference between “total sugars content” and “total carbohydrates”? Also, two methods were described for starch determination: Page 2, Line 11:Starch content is calculated starting from the percentage of total carbohydrates and total sugars x Page 2, Line 14:-15:Starch content was determined by the polarimetric method. In Page 2, Line 23, what “Anonymous, 1998” Means? In my opinion results and discussion section can not be evaluated since there is a problem with the data presented for the composition of	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	tubers. Considering only the total of nutrient components of the tubers given in Table II, they are higher than 100%. Also, how the authors explain the starch content higher than the total carbohydrates? For the antinutritional factors authors should confirm if they are dealing with sapogenins or saponins. The identification of Figures should be given in English instead of French. The pages and lines should be numbered in order to facilitate the revision.	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer