

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Biotechnology Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJI_95921
Title of the Manuscript:	Phenolic and physical characterizations of red wines produced from vernacular grapes (<i>Vitis vinifera</i>) in Turkey
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.journalbjournal.com/index.php/BJI/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)
Compulsory 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	The manuscript sounds scientifically well and contributes to value red grape from tukey in winemaking. The title of article is well written and suitable. The abstract is comprehensive. However the results should be re-structured. Each table summarizing the results of each sub section must be placed below the corresponding paragraph. Moreover, the authors must added chromatographs supporting the results of the last table. The references are sufficient and well written.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
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:	Bayoï James Ronald
Department, University & Country	Cameroon