



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_45699
Title of the Manuscript:	Phytochemical Screening and Antioxidant Properties of Coagulants and Soft cheese Produced from Goat milk using Dfferent Biocoagulants of Plant Origin
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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>All Phytochemical are present in the Biocoagulants of Plant Origin, so that the amount of those compounds in Soft cheese from Goat milk depends of the amount of biocoagulant added to the milk and the relative content of different molecular antioxidant types in the plant extracts, rather than in the goat milk. It is useless to estimate the concentration in the biocoagulants and then in the cheese. There should be a correlation. As stated at lines 262-264.</p> <p>DPPH scavenging activity cannot be given as % of an unknown control (see abstract).</p> <p>The plant extracts should be more detailed in the introduction and methods. For instance, at 2.3 <i>Production of West African cheese. "The milk was stirred gently during the heating process with a wooden spoon. About 4mls of the leaf extract of Calotropis procera, Carica papaya, lemon juice, steep water were added to the warm milk.</i> The preparation should be detailed. About 4 ml is not correct for quantitative determinations. 4 ml is correct, but is added to milk? How much milk?</p> <p>Methods for section 2.4.2, 2.4.3, 2.4.4, 2.4.5, 2.4.6, 2.4.7 and 2.4.8 are totally unspecific and many details about samples are not given. These methods are useless. Eliminate all qualitative and unspecific assays, including Table 1.</p> <p>Section 2.5 is quantitative. This section is assumable in an eventual revised version.</p> <p>Line 245: "The residue is the alkaloid, which was dried and weighed (Harborne, 1998)". I disagree, the residue would contain alkaloids, but many other things.</p> <p>Discussion would be reduced to avoid reiteration and trivial statements.</p>	<p>This section has been visited. The qualitative aspect has been removed as to this effect</p> <p>The DPPH scavenging activity has been properly stated</p> <p>The method for the production of West African soft cheese has been detailed. The methodology has been re written to give better information on the production process. The use of unspecific words such as 'about' has been corrected and the actual quantity of the raw milk has been given</p> <p>All qualitative and unspecific assays has been eliminated including all unspecified sections including table 1</p> <p>This has been properly looked into</p> <p>This statement has been corrected and proper information has been given</p> <p>The discussion has been reduced to avoid reiteration and trivial statements</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Avoid trivial statements: Lines 38-39: The reducing ability of a compound generally depends on the presence of reductants (Duh <i>et al.</i>, 1999)</p> <p>Line 86: The <i>dried cheese</i> sample ... What does it mean? What is cheese and distilled water proportion in normal cheese? What is the difference of wara/cheese? Any difference? I apologize about these doubts, but other future readers could also be confused about these points. Please, clarify.</p>	<p>This statement has been removed</p> <p>This has been clearly stated. All statements made have been properly justified in the manuscript.</p>
Optional/General comments	English should be edited	This has been done

Comment [P1]: Preparation methods?

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	Ethical issues: Not applicable