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	

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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments **1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) **2. Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) **3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** **4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** **5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** **6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	**1. The manuscript deals with a scientifically interesting topic and may have a positive impact on future research.** **2. Manuscript title is suitable.** **3. The abstract is satisfactory and clear. I proposed some additions that would have a positive effect on the clarity of the experiment setting.** **4. The paper is properly organized and divided into clear subsections.** **5. Result discussion should be expanded and supplemented by comparing the obtained results with similar scientific research, which will increase the importance of this paper.** **6. References are satisfactory, but new ones need to be added to support the discussion.**	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	**The English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.**	
Optional/General comments	**All comments addressed to the authors are marked in the manuscript PDF file.**	

Review Form 1.7

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Danijela Šuput**
Department, University & Country	**University of Novi Sad, Republic of Serbia**