

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Biotechnology and Bioresource Technology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJB2T_130971 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | KINETICS OF Fe2+ AND VITAMIN C RETENTION IN A NOUVELLE CONTINUOUS AND SIMULTANEOUS EXTRACTION AND PASTEURIZATION SYSTEM: APPLICATION TO Justicia Secunda BEVERAGE. |
| Type of the Article | Original Research Article |

PART 1: Comments

| | Reviewer’s comment | Author’s Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
|--|--|--|
| Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | This manuscript presents a valuable contribution to food processing and nutritional retention by analysing the retention kinetics of Fe ²⁺ and vitamin C in a continuous simultaneous extraction and pasteurization system for Justicia secunda beverages. The study effectively compares this method with conventional extraction and pasteurization, highlighting the superior retention capabilities of the proposed system. Given the increasing global interest in sustainable and nutrient-preserving food processing methods, this research is relevant to both academia and industry. | Noted |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | The title is clear and reflects the study's content. However, it could be slightly refined for conciseness. "Retention Kinetics of Fe ²⁺ and Vitamin C in a Continuous Simultaneous Extraction and Pasteurization System for Justicia Secunda Beverage." | Title revised |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | The abstract is well-structured, summarizing the objectives, methods, key findings, and implications. It effectively conveys the significance of the research. One suggestion is to include a concluding remark on the broader industrial implications of the findings. | Ok |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | The manuscript is scientifically sound, with appropriate experimental design and data analysis. The kinetic modelling is well-executed, and the statistical evaluations are adequate. A minor suggestion is to expand on the limitations of the study, particularly in terms of potential scalability challenges. | Done revision |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | The references are up-to-date and relevant. However, incorporating more recent studies on continuous food processing systems would further strengthen the literature review | OK |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The manuscript is written in clear and comprehensible English suitable for scholarly communication. Minor grammatical corrections may enhance readability. | |
| Optional/General comments | The graphical representations of kinetic models and comparisons could be optimized for better clarity. Standardizing terminologies throughout the manuscript will enhance consistency. Including a brief discussion on the environmental and economic benefits of the proposed method could add value. | Effected revision |

Review Form 3

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? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |