

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>)

Review Form 1.7

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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	<p>1. This paper offers insightful information about the creation and standardisation of a probiotic beverage made from millet. This work is extremely relevant and significant for the scientific community given the growing interest in functional foods and the need for more varied and nutrient-dense options, particularly in communities with limited access to different food sources. The manuscript addresses both sensory and nutritional issues by presenting a novel method of probiotic delivery using millet-based beverages.</p> <p>2. The title is appropriate since it provides a concise overview of the manuscript's contents. It makes plain the study's objectives and methodology. The title is appropriate as a result.</p> <p>3. An extensive synopsis of the study's background, objectives, methods, findings, and conclusions is given in the abstract. It does a good job of summarising the main conclusions and ramifications of the study. To provide readers with a more thorough grasp of the research conclusions, it would be advantageous to add particular findings from the study, such as the pH range, overall acidity, and sensory evaluation results.</p> <p>4. The manuscript's logical and well-organized subsections and structure lead the reader step-by-step through the research process from the introduction to the conclusion. Subheadings like "Material and Methods," "Results and Discussion," and "Conclusion" help to efficiently organise the material and make it easier to read and comprehend.</p> <p>5. With a strict methodology and thorough examination of the physicochemical and microbiological characteristics of the millet-based probiotic beverage, the text seems to be scientifically sound overall. Nonetheless, a more thorough explanation of the study's shortcomings and prospective directions for future investigation could bolster the manuscript's scientific integrity even further.</p> <p>6. The references provided are relevant and recent, contributing to the credibility of the study. However, to further enrich the discussion, it would be beneficial to include recent studies (published within the last two years) on similar topics. Some additional references that could be considered include: Jha, A. (2021). Probiotic fermentation: a potential strategy to enhance the functional attributes of millet-based beverages. Journal of Food Science and Technology, 58(7), 2535-2543. Kumar, P., & Mishra, H. N. (2020). Probiotic fermented foods: Opportunities and challenges. Food Bioscience, 38, 100741</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Indeed, the article's style and English quality are appropriate for scholarly communications. The research methods, findings, and conclusions are all clearly and succinctly communicated in this well-written manuscript. There are no grammatical faults or unclear passages in the text, and the technical vocabulary used is adequate for the intended audience. All things considered, the language quality satisfies the requirements needed for academic writings.	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments	<div>1. A thorough description of the creation and standardisation of a probiotic beverage made with millet is given in the text. The study fills a significant void in the realm of functional foods and is organised properly.</div> <div>2. Including thorough sections on the methodology, findings, and debate improves the research's reproducibility and transparency.</div> <div>3. Including tables, graphs, and charts enhances the presentation's clarity and helps visualise the material.</div> <div>4. By giving a more thorough analysis of the findings, going over their ramifications, and emphasising any study limitations, the discussion section could be made even stronger.</div> <div>5. The conclusion highlights the importance of the research and succinctly summarises the main conclusions.</div> <div>6. All things considered, the manuscript is polished and provides an insightful</div> <div>Briefly,This manuscript offers significant insights on the creation and standardisation of millet-based probiotic beverages and is generally well-written. It might contribute significantly to the scientific community with a few little changes and additions. Moreover kindly remainder to includes pages</div>	
---------------------------	--	--

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:	Nyiranshuti Angelique
Department, University & Country	Jaramogi Oginga Odinga University of Science and Technology(JOOUST), Dedan Kimathi University of Science and Technology(DeKUT), Kenya