

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_122167
Title of the Manuscript:	DEVELOPMENT AND CHARACTERIZATION OF ANTIOXIDANT-RICH POMEGRANATE AND BEETROOT JUICE
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
<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. Indeed, fruit juices are commonly used in human nutrition. Furthermore, chronic diseases constitute a real public health problem. The production and consumption of antioxidant-rich juice based on beetroot and pomegranate could contribute to preventing chronic diseases and increasing the life expectancy of populations.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>I propose as a title: Formulation and characterization of antioxidant-rich pomegranate and beetroot juice</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>The abstract of the article is not comprehensive.</p> <p>The context of this study is not well presented in this abstract because the problem is not well presented. The author must situate the problem that led to produce juices rich in antioxidants. The methodology is not presented succinctly and exhaustively. In the methodology, the author only presents the sensory evaluation and the determination of parameters such as physicochemical parameters, the content of phenolic compounds, flavonoids, anthocyanins, antioxidant activity are not presented in the abstract. The author does not present the results of the juice or juices that had the best contents of phenolic compounds, flavonoids, anthocyanins and antioxidant activity. There is no conclusion and inclusion in the abstract. I propose that the abstract be taken up with a context of the study presented succinctly and clearly that situates the problem. The methodology should be presented succinctly with the determination of the sensory quality, the content of phenolic compounds, flavonoids, anthocyanins and the antioxidant activity of the juices. The results of the juice(s) that presented the best antioxidant activities, the best contents of phenolic compounds, flavonoids and anthocyanins should be noted in the abstract. Finally, the abstract should include a conclusion and an inclusion.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are not appropriate</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>This paper is scientifically accurate because the methodology used is appropriate, the results are interesting and could be beneficial for the community. The authors formulated juices from varying proportions of beetroot and pomegranate juices. The majority of these formulated juices presented acceptable sensory quality and good antioxidant activity, especially the T9 formulation. However, the authors should provide the context of this study in the introduction and the abstract as well for a better understanding of this topic. Furthermore, the discussion should be expanded to give more strength to this manuscript.</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 if the authors deepen the discussion, there will be more references</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English language/quality of the article is suitable for scientific communications	
Optional/General comments	Authors should review the writing of the references. There are references that the authors have cited in the manuscript that are not found in the list of references	

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:	N'zi Kouadio Patrick
Department, University & Country	Université Nangui Abrogoua, Côte d'ivoire