

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFRN_125431
Title of the Manuscript:	Development of Floral Based Fermented Drink with Mahua Flowers
Type of the Article	Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	Although the study attempts to produce wine from natural sources in order to curb the use of alcoholic beverages, yet no strong data has been presented to show that the developed product is better than traditional available wines which are also produced from natural sources. Also, the cost effectiveness of the product as well as the shelf life needs to be depicted.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Abstract has to be re-written in an improved scientific writing format to provide readers with a comprehensive view. The importance of the study needs to be properly highlighted.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No. Article has to be divided into appropriate sub-sections.	
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.	The scientific robustness and technicality needs to be improved. It is better to re-write the manuscript with some additional experiments regarding importance, cost, shelf life etc. The way of writing also needs to be improved.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	More number of recent references should be added (2019 and beyond).	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No. language and construction of the manuscript needs improvement.	
Optional/General comments	Although the study seeks to manufacture wine from natural sources in order to reduce the consumption of alcoholic beverages, no substantial evidence has been offered to indicate that the resulting product is superior than traditional wines made from natural sources. Also, the product's cost-effectiveness and shelf life must be depicted.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anindita Deb Pal
Department, University & Country	J.D. Birla Institute, India