

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_102654
Title of the Manuscript:	Studies On the Preparation and Shelf life Of Aloe Vera Juice
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://www.journalafsj.com/index.php/AFSJ/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><b>Compulsory</b> 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><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The manuscript show a comprehensive investigation of some quality properties for different aloe vera juices. The content of the manuscript is good and enough for publication, but the format and the grammar is not in the suitable level for scientific journal.</p> <p>yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>Based on my opinion "2.2 Apparatus and Equipment" part is not necessary The result part should be extended with the sensory diagrams.</p> <p>Yes, but the mistakes has to be corrected</p> <p>The format of the references is not useful for evaluation! It is not possible the identify the cited papers.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English of the manuscript is not capable for publication. I suggest a major review for the language problems.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Based on the language and the format of the manuscript it is not capable for publication.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Gabor Zsivanovits</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Institute of Food Preservation and Quality, Plovdiv, Agricultural Academy of Bulgaria, Bulgaria</b>