

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFRN_102885
Title of the Manuscript:	HPLC characterization and sensorial analysis of kombucha based synbiotic beverage infused with chicory root powder (<i>Cichorium intybus</i>)
Type of the Article	Original Research 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, it is Ok in general, but it can be improve in these parts: in the last paragraph of the introduction should be highlighted what is the novel part, the typological errors, the references once more to be seen in the text should be in the same number as in the section References. The description of the figures as well as comparison with the references in the discussion is poorly done.</p> <p>2. The title is ok</p> <p>3. The Abstract is Ok</p> <p>4. Focus on discussion part</p> <p>5. In general yes</p> <p>6. Once to be checked</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	There are errors should be corrected in the last version	
<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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Olga Popovska
Department, University & Country	“Mother Teresa” University in Skopje, North Macedonia