



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>This work was an attempt to assess the bioactivity of cheese biocoagulants and of the cheese itself. Please, find my a summary of my comments bellow, and further in the manuscript file.</p> <p>Introduction – the introduction needs to be restructured, as it is sectioned in lose sentences without connection. The paragraphs are not connected with each other (there is no linkage among the subjects within each paragraph).</p> <p>Materials and methods – this section needs major revising. The observations are in the manuscript file. Mainly, they must be written in order to be reproduced; some of the references cited are not easily accessed, either replace them or make the methodology description very clear; the original papers of the methodologies should be cited, not the one who cited it; the conditions at which the experiments were carried should always be presented (temperature, time, etc.); state that for ALL the analysis replicates were carried, and how many. I suggest adding the brand, model and country of equipments employed (when or if it is the case). There are methodologies that were cited, but the description of it does not follow the reference cited -> make sure you make proper citations, and mention if there were modifications carried by you or by other authors.</p> <p>Results and discussion – if results and discussion are to be separated sections, make sure you do not repeat results from tables, neither in the discussion section.</p> <p>Discussion: – How could you relate the qualitative and quantitative results of the work? -> Add that information to your work. - I suggest you also bring the focus of your discussion to the importance of using biocoagulants, not only because of their bioactivity, but related to production costs, accessibility of products, they are plant originated (natural), they add value to the final product, as they allow the transfer of bioactives to it as mentioned in the work, waste exploitation, etc.</p>	<p>The introduction has been restructured, and the paragraph has now been connected with each other.</p> <p>The materials and methodology section has been revisited, better methodology has been detailed and given appropriate references that is easily accessible. The temperature at which the experiments are carried out has been included e.g the temperature, time e.t.c. Replicates were carried out in all the analysis (3). The brand and model of all the equipments such as spectrophotometer, centrifuge e.t.c are now included. The references of the methodology and where necessary modifications were done has been mentioned.</p> <p>Results and discussion section has been merged together for better clarification so as to avoid repetitions.</p> <p>The qualitative aspect of the work has been removed as suggested by one of the reviewer. The focus of the discussion has been broadened including the bioactivity, production costs, value added product e.t.c</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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>	Ethical issues: Not applicable