

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JABB_112556</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>“Standardization and evaluation of quality attributes and bioactive components of Ginger (<i>Zingiber officinale</i> Roscoe) and Kokum (<i>Garcinia indica</i> Choisy) based herbal tea”</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Research</b>

## 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p><b>Yes. Nowadays, everyone is focused about their health and herbal tea is a pave way to provide the nutrition to the community.</b></p> <p><b>Yes, Title is suitable enough.</b></p> <p><b>No, The abstract needs to be refine as so many typographical mistakes are present. Keywords need to be change as author used symbols in the list.</b></p> <p>repetition of many headings</p> <p>No, most of the references are old.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Author fail to provide the information of the panellists (Trained, Untrained, Semi-trained). Number of panellists were not sufficient to evaluate the product.</li> <li>• Manuscript is not well written and more look like a review literature type.</li> <li>• Very confusing statement of First best as author writing first best for T7 and T3 etc.</li> <li>• No picture of the samples has been given.</li> <li>• No picture of the final sample has been given.</li> <li>• Under the heading 3.3 the statement "These results are supported by Raju" written with no citation.</li> <li>• Above the caption of Table 1. Experiment 1 is written why?</li> <li>• All the table and graph captions with the period at the end.</li> <li>• In table 5 why duration is written under the heading of Treatments?</li> <li>• In conclusion numbering has been given, why?</li> <li>• In storage study why 30 days gap has been taken?</li> <li>• Many places unnecessary in between the sentence full stop is mention.</li> <li>• The author advise to go through with the author guidelines of the journal and make corrections accordingly.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>No, poor English is used throughout the manuscript.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> 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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Sonia Morya</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Lovely Professional University, India</b>