

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_124218
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of Natural Preservatives on the Quality of Fresh Pineapple Fruit Juice
Type of the Article	Original 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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<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>This manuscript is important for the scientific community because it identifies the use of natural preservatives, which are gaining interest due to consumer demand for healthier, safer, and chemical-free food products. Researching the antimicrobial efficacy of common natural extracts like clove, garlic, ginger, and moringa seeds provides valuable insights into extending the shelf life of fresh juices while maintaining safety and quality. I appreciate the practical application of this research, as it addresses real-world challenges in food preservation. However, a more in-depth analysis of the procedures behind the antimicrobial effects could strengthen the study's contribution to the field and will make it more appreciated</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title can be adjusted a little "The Antimicrobial Efficacy and Quality Changes in Pineapple Juice Treated with Natural Preservatives".</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>It is fairly comprehensive, covering the key elements of the study such as the natural preservatives used, the concentrations, microbial findings, and the impact on pineapple juice quality. However, it could benefit from a clearer explanation of the significance of the findings in terms of their broader impact on food preservation. Including more details about the storage conditions, such as temperature, would provide a clearer understanding of the experiment. Additionally, the specific analytical methods used to assess the chemical and microbial properties could be briefly mentioned for more context. The statistical tool was not mentioned as well. Overall, it's detailed but could use a slight explanation in certain areas.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The sub-sections are appropriate but just that some headings are not properly arranged.</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>The manuscript appears scientifically sound as it follows a clear experimental procedure, including the use of controls and standard analytical methods for assessing microbial counts and chemical composition. The choice of natural preservatives and their concentrations seems reasonable, and the inclusion of both antibacterial and antifungal activity adds depth to the study. However, to ensure full scientific robustness, more information on the methodology such as how the zones of inhibition were measured and controlled conditions during storage would be beneficial. While the findings are valuable, ensuring replicability and providing more detailed statistical analyses would strengthen the manuscript further.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references are sufficient but most of them are not recent only a few are.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English language used is suitable for scholarly communication just that a few sentence reconstruction and grammar errors could be worked on in this manuscript	
Optional/General comments	5 preservatives were being used and 4 were touched on in the introduction but one was not mentioned which is nutmeg. The temperature of the solution of the preservatives is not mentioned. Different storage conditions should have been applied in this experiment, at least aside from the room temperature, the treated pineapple juice could have been stored under normal refrigeration conditions because that is the reality of storing fresh fruit juice. The flow chart is not in the right place, it should have gone to the pineapple juice preparation heading. Also, it is taking a lot of space so if it can be made to fit a page, that will be great.	

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:	Oforiwaah Kukuwaa Smith
Department, University & Country	University of Cape Coast, Ghana