

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_96962
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Quality characteristics and storage stability of peanut beverage added ginger, moringa leaf powder and Lime
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.journalejns.com/index.php/EJNFS/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes 2. Yes 3. The abstract must be improved. It contains too many details about the materials and methods, as well results. The abstract should be a concise presentation of the manuscript. Therefore, please reformulate entirely, reducing all materials and methods to 2 phrases, results 2 phrases and highlight the conclusions and importance of the study. 4. Yes 5. No. The discussion of the results is non-existent in the present form of the manuscript. 6. References are insufficient (4 references), although there are some references cited in the text which do not appear in the list of the references at the end of the manuscript. For example: Vazquez-leon et al., 2017, Orwa et a., 2009, Rustom et al., 1995, de Saint Sauveur (2010), Duncan, 2003. However, they are not enough. Please study more articles about this topic in order to properly write the discussion section which is now completely missing. <p>Abstract</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Please rewrite entirely the abstract in a shorter, more concise form and add a phrase of conclusions. <p>Introduction:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. Please revise and use the same measure unit when expressin the quantities of the minerals. "peanut beverage are rich in essential nutrients, in a long serving, peanut provides 570 calories and are excellent source of several B vitamins, Vitamin E, several dietary minerals such as manganese (95 %), magnesium (525 DV) and potassium (48 % DV) and dietary fibre." 9. Please revise and reformulate, it is unclear if Yoruba, Hausa and Igbo are regions in Nigeria or are languages spoken in certain areas. "In Nigeria, Moringa oleifera is known as "Ewe-ile" in Yoruba, "Samarin Dange" in Hausa and "Okwe oyibo" in Igbo." <p>Materials and methods</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 10. Please simplify the acronyms of the samples by removing the PN which is repeating to each one and this is making more difficult to read. 11. Please delete "proceurement of". 12. Please write Kjedahl, with capital K. <p>Sensory evaluation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 13. Evaluators: What were the criteria of selection the staff to participate in the test? What was the average age \pm standard deviation? Gender ratio between the participants? 14. Samples: What was the order of the samples during the tasting sessions? If samples were coded, how were the samples coded? Were there any neutralisers used? How many tasting sessions were? How many samples per session? How did the authors address the sensory fatigue? 15. Hedonic scale: please explain the significance of the values 1 to 9 of the scale as it was used with the panelists. 16. How were the data from the hedonic test interpreted? 	

Review Form 1.7

	Results 17. Please start with a paragraph remembering the aim of the study, before the table 1 with results. 18. Please try to calculate the correlation between the sensory perception of taste and the pH or titrable acidity of the beverage (use CORREL function from Microsoft Excel).	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Laura Stan
Department, University & Country	University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine, Romania