

ReviewForm3

JournalName:	AsianJournalofAdvancedResearchandReports
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_AJARR_125693
TitleoftheManuscript:	FORMULATIONANDASSESSMENTOFGINGERCANDYSUPPLEMENTEDWITHBEETROOTPOMACEPOWDER
TypeoftheArticle	Experimental

ReviewForm3

PART1: ReviewComments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that a author should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p><i>The study's innovative use of an underutilized crop and a by-product from juice production demonstrates a promising approach to food development. Focusing on the popular confectionery market for children further enhances the potential impact of this research</i></p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p><i>I propose incorporating the term 'Development' into the title to more accurately reflect the focus of the research.</i></p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p><i>While the abstract provides a comprehensive overview, it could be enhanced by incorporating more specific technical terminology. Instead of using general terms like 'better,' consider employing more precise phrases such as 'significantly higher/lower' or 'increased/decreased.' Additionally, highlight the most significant findings rather than simply stating the presence of observed results.</i></p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p><i>This subsection under phytochemical analysis is currently presented in a letter format. To maintain consistency with the preceding section titles, it should be reformatted into a more standard heading style.</i></p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p><i>The manuscript generally adheres to sound scientific principles in its methodology and results. However, certain aspects of the experimental procedures could be presented with greater specificity. Additionally, the discussion section should delve more deeply into the implications of the findings and provide a more comprehensive comparison with relevant literature.</i></p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p><i>While the existing references are generally adequate for the submitted manuscript, the methodology, results, and discussion could benefit from further elaboration and support through additional scholarly sources</i></p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p><i>The tone and terminology of the writings should be refined to align more closely with academic standards.</i></p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Needs improvement on the methodology, and results and discussion</p>	

ReviewForm3
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:	Franz Z. Miranda
Department, University & Country	Institute of Engineering and Applied Technology, Bulacan Agricultural State College, Philippines