

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFRN_116942
Title of the Manuscript:	Characterization and standardization of a millet-based probiotic beverage via physicochemical and microbial analysis
Type of the Article	Original research 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:

(<https://journalajfrn.com/index.php/AJFRN/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript deals with a scientifically interesting topic and may have a positive impact on future research.</p> <p>2. Manuscript title is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract is satisfactory and clear. I proposed some additions that would have a positive effect on the clarity of the experiment setting.</p> <p>4. The paper is properly organized and divided into clear subsections.</p> <p>5. Result <u>discussion</u> should be expanded and supplemented by comparing the obtained results with similar scientific research, which will increase the importance of this paper.</p> <p>6. References are satisfactory, but new ones need to be added to support the discussion.</p>	<p>1. The manuscript explores a crucial scientific topic with potential implications for future research.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title is suitable</p> <p>3. The abstract provides a comprehensive overview of the article's content highlighting the key aspects of the research conducted</p> <p>4. Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are well suited for conveying the research findings clearly</p> <p>5. The manuscript adheres to scientific principles and presents accurate information.</p> <p>6. Thanks for the feedback. We will review the references and consider adding new ones.</p>
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

<b>Optional/General</b> comments	All comments addressed to the authors are marked in the manuscript PDF file.	Yes
----------------------------------	--	-----

PART 2:

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