

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_119875
Title of the Manuscript:	Studies on bio-chemical attributes of spiced beetroot Ready-to-Serve (RTS) beverage
Type of the Article	

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>While this research presents interesting ideas, it would benefit from further development and maturation to fully demonstrate its potential impact.</p> <p>To enhance clarity and alignment, it may be helpful to adjust the title to better reflect the main objective of the research, which is discussed in the last paragraph of the introduction. Specifically, focusing on the role of ginger addition and the methods to reduce the loss of bio-active ingredients during industrial processing.</p> <p>The structure is well-organized and effectively presents the research.</p> <p>The experimental section is promising. It could benefit from some refinement and optimization, and citing appropriate sources would strengthen its credibility further.</p> <p>To strengthen the manuscript, it would be helpful to include additional references and compare your research results with existing literature.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>List1, treatment details (in List1, the treatment details suggest that the experiment was conducted in a single day, but the Results and Discussion section refers to results from days 1, 2, etc. This discrepancy needs clarification. Could you please explain how the treatment combinations were determined and provide details on the proportion used? Additionally, since reproducibility is crucial, how were you able to perform triplicate analyses within a single day for multiple variables? Clarifying these points will strengthen the validity of the experimental design).</p> <p>Please ensure that all statements in the experimental section are written in the past tense, and maintain uniformity in font size throughout the document.</p> <p>This manuscript requires revision and resubmission. Please address the feedback provided to enhance the quality of the work.</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:	Siyum Shewakena Beshahwored
Department, University & Country	National Taiwan University of Science and Technology, Taiwan