

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Zoology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIZ_100621
Title of the Manuscript:	PROXIMATE COMPOSITION AND CONSUMPTION CONSTRAINTS OF EDIBLE FOREST INSECTS IN THREE LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREAS OF CROSS RIVER STATE, NIGERIA
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:

(<https://www.journalajriz.com/index.php/AJRIZ/editorial-policy> )

## Review Form 1.7

### PART 1: 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?  4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?  5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?  6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.  <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. I believe this is significant for the nutrition world and finding alternate nutrient dense food source for communities lacking enough food to meet nutritional needs. 2. Title is suitable. It tells what the article is about and where it was studied. 3. The results in the abstract does not mention the questionnaire results. The rest is a good overview of the paper. 4. Come back to this 5. Yes, I believe the it to be scientifically correct. 6. The references were sufficient in number, but many were over 5 years old. Especially Durst and Shono since it was used to report the increase in prices. What is happening more recently than 13 years ago? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Introduction: You say "there is growing <i>agitation</i> for the inclusion of processed.." Agitation has negative connotations. While there are some concerns by some people groups, I'm not sure this is the word you want here. I'm not sure what you are trying to say so I can't offer an alternative.</li> <li>Later in the Introduction: "Also, edible insects have proven to be <i>reach</i> sources of mineral and vitamins" I believe you mean <i>rich</i> sources. Also, the article you used as a reference only refers to minerals, how can you also include vitamins? Is there another source you could include?</li> <li>In your Methods you need a paragraph discussing how you collected your survey data. This is totally absent from this section.</li> <li>Table 1: can you find the significant differences between the species for each column? It would give your conclusion more support.</li> <li>Table 2: it is not clear how you calculated the mean scores (Put it in your methods). Across each column the SA, A, D, and SD do not add up to the total.</li> <li>Conclusion: I don't know how you came to the conclusion that termites and oil palm grubs had the highest nutritional components. Did you add up the protein, fat and carbohydrates and compare or what? I cannot support this conclusion without knowing your criteria.</li> </ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In your conclusion, a recommendation on how to overcome the constraints would be helpful and insightful.</li> </ul>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>You did a good job with your comparison to others' findings.</li> <li>I appreciate how you broke down table two by areas.</li> </ul>	

### PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Karen Breshears
Department, University & Country	University of Central Missouri, USA