

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFRN_102611
Title of the Manuscript:	ORGANOLEPTIC CHARACTERISTICS OF TIGER NUT DRINK (KUNU AYAYA) PRESERVED BY HERBS.
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://journalajfrn.com/index.php/AJFRN/editorial-policy>)

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The article proposes an interesting topic for the scientific community, to preserve the organoleptic qualities of drinks with various herbs, but unfortunately the study is not carried out in a scientific manner, being superficially thought and supported. The organoleptic qualities should have been analyzed separately, taste, aroma, color, etc. and denote a serious study, with a possible reporting scale of these traits, and thus quite empirical.</p> <p>The chosen title is eloquent and faithfully reflects the content of the article.</p> <p>The abstract reflects the value of the study, it is also unfortunately suggestive of the scientific fragility of the study.</p> <p>In principle, the article respects the structure of a study, but the study method must be improved, so that the results are more consistent and supported by a larger discussion chapter, with eloquent bibliographic references.</p> <p>In terms of scientific correctness, it is difficult to appreciate, considering that the study lacks scientific rigor.</p> <p>The bibliography should contain more bibliographic indexes, with more suggestive references in the text.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English used is correct, keywords should be chosen more suggestively.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Cirimbei Ciprian
Department, University & Country	Institute of Oncology Bucharest, University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Romania