

### ReviewForm3

JournalName:	<a href="#">AnnualResearch&amp;ReviewinBiology</a>
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_ARRB_124653
TitleoftheManuscript:	Effect of blending cashew apple ( <i>Anacardium occidentale</i> L.) and aonla ( <i>Emblica officinalis</i> Gaertn.) juice on quality of wine during storage
Typeof the Article	ResearchArticle

#### PART1:ReviewComments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISIONcomments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Pleasecorrectthemanuscriptandhighlightthatpartinthemanuscript.Itismandatorythatauthorsshouldwritehis/herfeedbackhere)
<b>Pleasewriteafewsentencesregardingtheimportanceofthismanuscriptforthescientificcommunity.Whydoyoulike(ordislike)thismanuscript?Aminimumof3-4sentencesmayberequiredforthispart.</b>	The manuscript offers valuable insights into the wine quality resulting from blending cashew apple and aonla juices, but significant revisions are required. The abstract lacks proper structure, and the methodology needs more detail on fermentation conditions. Results presentation should be clearer, with the inclusion of visual aids, and the statistical methods must be better explained	
<b>Isthe title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<b>Yes</b>	
<b>Isthe abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in the introduction? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	<b>Require more attentions (Rebuttal report is submitted)</b>	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	<b>Require more attentions (Rebuttal report is submitted)</b>	
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	<b>Require more attentions (Rebuttal report is submitted)</b>	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	<b>Require more attentions (Rebuttal report is submitted)</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISIONcomments		
<b>Isthe language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	<b>Require more attentions (Rebuttal report is submitted)</b>	

**ReviewForm3**

**Optional/General** comments

**Require more attentions (Rebuttal report is submitted)**

Here are some subjective and technical deficiencies identified in the manuscript "Effect of blending cashew apple (*Anacardium occidentale* L.) and aonla (*Emblica officinalis* Gaertn.) juice on quality of wine during storage," based on ARRB's author guidelines:

1. Lack of Clarity and Organization in Abstract:

Abstract, lines 1–15

Issue: The abstract lacks clear organization into distinct sections such as Aims, Methodology, Results, and Conclusion. This reduces clarity and makes it harder to follow.

2. Redundant Information:

Introduction, lines 24–36

Issue: There is repetition about the nutritional value and antioxidant properties of cashew apple and aonla. The manuscript would benefit from conciseness and focus on essential background details.

3. Overgeneralized Statements:

Introduction, lines 55–59

Issue: The manuscript includes general statements about the benefits of wine for health without sufficient citation of supporting studies, which can be considered speculative.

4. Improper Referencing Format:

Throughout the manuscript, especially in the References section, page 10

Issue: References do not consistently adhere to the ARRB format. For example, journal names and issue numbers should follow a standard format.

5. Ambiguity in Experimental Methodology:

Materials and Methods, lines 1–15, page 5

Issue: There is insufficient detail on the yeast strain used and specific fermentation conditions. This lack of detail affects reproducibility.

6. Incorrect Use of Units and Symbols:

Tables and Results section, Table 1, page 7

Issue: Symbols for measurements, such as "°Brix" and "%" for percentages, are inconsistently presented. Following a standard format (e.g., space between number and unit) would improve readability.

7. Inconsistent Terminology:

Results, line 29, page 8

Issue: The terminology for sugar content (T.S.S., total sugars, reducing sugars) should be consistently used and defined early in the manuscript for clarity.

8. Lack of Statistical Analysis Explanation:

Results section, throughout, pages 8–9

Issue: Although statistical values are presented, the manuscript does not provide sufficient explanation

**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>Gyanendra Singh</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Motherhood University, India</b>