

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_85277
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of process time on the physicochemical, antinutrient and phytochemical properties of Ficus capensis Moraceae vegetable drink
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://www.journalafsj.com/index.php/AFSJ/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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	<p>The authors are testing the impact of the processing time on the composition of a vegetable drink, which is quite interesting but its originality is lacking.</p> <p>ABSTRACT</p> <p>Can the authors justify why the drink is being boiled for 30, 60 and 90 min? Because it is clear that long processing times will affect the product quality. So what is the importance of doing these treatments?</p> <p>The language need to be improved. They are some orthographic and grammatical errors in the abstract. The verbal tense etc.</p> <p>Introduction The problem is not clearly stated and need to be improved. Background information of such study is needed at the introduction. Authors said the leaves are prepared for a long time. What is the time used by locals? Specify it and why is it so long? Drinks Should be formulated and pasteurized. Heating for 60 and 90 min is already a kind of sterilization and many nutrients such as vitamins are not stables under such conditions. It is a drink? If yes specify the type. Or is a traditional medicine.</p> <p>Materials and method The identification code of the plant should be provided.</p> <p>Section 2.2 Preparation of sample shows that the author made a kind of infusion Can the authors justify the Selected Vitamins and Mineral content determination? Why only these selected ones?????</p> <p>2.3.3. Physicochemical content determination The drinks' specific gravity was determined with a specific gravity bottle and calculated as described by Ishiwu and Oluka [10]. A pH meter was used to determine the pH of the drinks. Titratable acidity was determined as percentage malic acid according to AACC [11] method. No formulation was done or the work is not about a fruit juice for example. Why is the author testing the Ph? When it is clear that we are dealing with a decoction?</p> <p>The authors mentioned that this work determine the optimal process time and process effect on the composition of the Ficus capensis drink.. No experimental plan is given in the methodology? Was optimization effectively done in this work? It looks like it was not the case. Authors should use the appropriate words to correct that.</p> <p>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</p> <p>Results are well presented and discussed.</p> <p>CONCLUSION</p> <p>The conclusion should be re-written highlighting the objective of the study and the main findings.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fabrice Tonfack Djikeng
Department, University & Country	University of Buea, Cameroon