

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>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>1. Many studies have been done on aloe vera juice and it is also commercially produced. In addition, by making use of the protective properties of the extracts obtained, the preservation period of the food is extended. Studies have also proven its effects on human health. The study contributes to the proliferation of scientific data and to support the studies.</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. No, some titles have been opened twice unnecessarily.</p> <p>5. Some scientific terms are spelled (metabisulphite, Titrabic, significant deference etc.)incorrectly. Scientific statements are wrong. It should be reviewed and checked again.</p> <p>6. The most recent citation dates back to 2016. With a simple search of databases comprising scientific articles, one should gain access to a large number of current articles and enrich the article.</p> <p>7. The article should definitely be reviewed in terms of writing rules.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sultan Acun
Department, University & Country	Amasya University, Türkiye