

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_74643
Title of the Manuscript:	PRODUCTION OF AN ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE FROM RICE ( <i>Oryzae sativa</i> ) USING NIGERIAN PALM WINE YEASTS
Type of the Article	

### **General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Check the general format, space, comma, spelling            Include some of the sensory taste results in the abstract            Be consistent. Flavour spelled in 2 different ways (lines 27 &amp; 40)            Sentence lines 41-43 is not clear (What is the overnight palm wine) is this during fermentation or after fermentation?</p> <p>45: replace amount with number. Check spelling of micro.            65: describe this Indigenous rice. Was it white, brown, black...?            66: explain briefly the physiological and biochemical tests and add a ref.            69: explain briefly how the Barnett <i>et al.</i> (2000) method work.            75: at what temperature. What was the reference method? Why 12 h only?            86: how did you measure the moisture in the germinated grains?            89: Wort preparation, describe more properly, add a ref method, add centrifuge and autoclave model and manufacturer, explain the reason for autoclaving at 100            o            C, not 121            C and under            pressure</p> <p>Methods of analyses are poorly described with no proper references or equipment model details.</p> <p>121: should have measured the yeast count. Writing concentrated yeasts is not enough.            131-132: incorrect descriptions of PH measurement. The standards are used to calibrate the PH meter, before measuring the PH.</p> <p>118 (Teramoto <i>et al.</i>, 1998) and 145 (Adesokan <i>et al.</i>, 2010): why did you use two different references for titratable acidity? Both follow same procedures!</p> <p>No explanation of the experimental design. Should have mentioned number of trials, and number of measurements within each trail.</p> <p>Table 2, listed soluble nitrogen, but M&amp;M didn't include the method of analysis!</p> <p>The discussion is very descriptive and lacks the in-depth analysis of results. For examples: Under materials and methods, the author described statistical analysis, but there was no mentioning of the statistic results in the discussion. Even standard deviations were not included.</p> <p>Table 3. Didn't mention if there any significant differences in the % ethanol production over time? Was 2.16% after 72 h different from 2.03 % at 0 h, and why? The same issue with all other characteristics mentioned in tables 3 and 4.            o</p> <p>Why neither ethanol nor viable counts were not determined at 0 h(Tables 3, 4, 5 and 6?)</p> <p>The dissection mentioned:            1. Increased acidity and ethanol resulted in the inhibition of pathogenic and spoilage microorganisms. It is not correct to make such a statement since your analyses didn't check for spoilage or pathogenic micoorganisms.</p> <p>2. "The wine produced by this yeast also received the highest scores for appearance,</p>	

## Review Form 1.6

	taste, <b>flavor</b> , aroma and overall acceptability." However, data in Table 7 showed very close values when comparing B and C. Statistical analysis should be performed in order to make a solid statement about such differences. Ref. <b>Chandrasekhar et al. listed 2012 in the reference list and 2021 in the text!!</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

### **PART 2:**

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

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Said Ajlouni</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>The University of Melbourne, Australia</b>