

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>)

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> <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 work is interesting in approach, but the grape varieties are of local interest. The appropriate analyses are performed, but the cited methods are not the appropriate ones (the correspondence with the OIV compendium methodology, which is freely accessible online (https://www.oiv.int/public/medias/7372/oiv-compendium-volume-1-2020.pdf), must be verified). Moreover, the two local varieties ("Hönüsü" and "Horoz karası") are intended for fresh consumption (table grapes) and secondary for wine. I would choose "<i>Physico-chemical characterization and polyphenolic composition of red wines produced from autochthonous grapes varieties (Vitis vinifera) in Turkey</i>" Yes. Yes. Yes. The references are not very recent (most of them in the 2004-2011 interval), although there are many recent studies on this topic. Please cite the OIV methodology (if it corresponds to the methods used), not a doctoral thesis that cannot be accessed. Also, VIVC numer (code) of the varieties (https://www.vivc.de/index.php?r=passport%2Fview&id=5411) must be mentioned. According to international databases, the two varieties belong to the species <i>V. vinifera</i> subsp. <i>vinifera</i>, please check and correct (in text is <i>V. vinifera</i> subsp. <i>silvestris</i>).</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>MATERIALS AND METHODS. The text must be corrected with the OIV methodology, the name of the varieties (and synonyms) and the species, briefly mentioning the climatic conditions of the cultivation area (see the indications above). Please mention once: potassium metabisulfite (PMB). As known, an ebulliometer can be used only for <i>white dry wines</i> alcoholic concentration assay; for red or sweet wines the boiling point changes and errors occur. Please mention the instruments used (e.g. HPLC series ..., column, temperature; pH-meter...model ...refractometer for Bx, etc)</p> <p>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION. please check the data in table 1 and in the text if they are correct, if 48-50 g/L of sugar remained in the wine (respectively 6-7 Brix) after the 147 days, then the alcoholic concentration cannot reach 12-13 % vol., keeping account that 1 volume of alcohol is produced from approx. 16.8-17.0 g of sugar (maybe is a mistake please check). Also, for the anthocyanin profile, is not the correct order of elution in HPLC column (cyanidin-3-O-monoglucoside is always the second compound eluted, while malvidin-3-O-monogl. is the last of the monoglucoside anthocyanin series), please check. Kocabey [16] is the same as Kocabe N., 2013, please correct.</p> <p>CONCLUSIONS. Here is recommended to use the integral name of the varieties ("HKRG is darker and contributes higher amounts of phenolics than HRG").</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Filimon V. Razvan
Department, University & Country	Research Development Station for Viticulture and Winemaking, Romania