

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_123131
Title of the Manuscript:	Sustainable Tea Innovation: Harnessing Orange Rind and Pineapple Core for Functional Beverage Development
Type of the Article	

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.	Personally I feel it's a great work. I already published a paper on health benefits of jaggery tea. As tea is the most popular drink not only in India but also worldwide, if it becomes a healthy beverage then it is very very good for society. I like his paper because it not only focuses on health but also making good use of waste products.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of paper should be specific. i.e. it should reflect exact aim of the paper. For this paper title is not specified that is it tea or beverage. If author is working on healthy tea development then title can be like harnessing orange rind and pineapple core for invention of healthy tea.	
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.	Aim should be more precise. "Physicochemical, phytochemical and sensory analysis of tea produced from orange rind and pineapple core" is good but we are doing analysis as well as innovation.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes. Subsections and structure is ok.	
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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. First is literature review regarding this work is done properly. 2. Material and methods for study are also taken properly. 3. Scientifically the formulas as well as graphs and tables give robustness to manuscript. 4. Based on study the conclusion drawn makes manuscript technically sound. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are recent so that much is sufficient for the manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes. English quality is good for scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments	No	

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>	

[Review Form 3](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bhagyashri Shivajirao Patil
Department, University & Country	Savitribai Phule Pune University, India