



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_48558
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Effects of Some Preservative Hurdles on the Quality of Zobo Stored at Ambient Temperature
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>Line 16 - More information about the raw materials is needed. Please cite other research papers considering other traditional beverages such as the Romanian <i>borș</i>: Effect of processing variables on the physico-chemical characteristics and aroma of <i>borș</i>, a traditional beverage derived from wheat bran.</p> <p>Pasqualone A¹, Summo C², Laddomada B³, Mudura E⁴, Coldea TE⁴. <i>Food Chem.</i> 2018 Nov 1;265:242-252. doi: 10.1016/j.foodchem.2018.05.095.</p> <p>Line 18 - Please use capital letters only when needed. Please check English grammar and vocabulary in entire document.</p> <p>Line 20 - Citing references is needed</p> <p>Line 38 - Please replace organoleptic properties with sensory analysis. Carbonatation is not considered a preserving method. Authors should rephrase the aim of the study.</p> <p>Line 43 - Please give details about how were the samples kept before the analysis/processing of the beverage.</p> <p>Line 50 - The recipe is not described carefully. Please specify the ratios of each added ingredient. More details about fermentation process is needed. Fermentation temperature is not specified. Chemical composition of the substrate was not analyzed. Fermentation monitoring would have been interesting to be presented.</p> <p>Line 102 - Please replace with sensory analysis.</p> <p>Line 104 - Panel of trained or untrained members?</p> <p>Line 106 - The replicates are not specified</p> <p>Line 118 - No explanation is given for table 2 and table 3. Are the presented data in accordance to previous studies? Why are the values G3 to G7 constant?</p> <p>Line 127 - Is not clear which are the two samples.</p> <p>Line 136 - More discussion is needed based on other citing references.</p> <p>Line 172 - Bx values is influenced by ethanol content. So this method is not the right one. Authors should describe the fermentation process in detail. Is not clear lactic, alcohol or both fermentations?</p> <p>Line 269 - Authors should replace the old references with more recent ones (preferably after the year 2010).</p>	Authors have agreed with the reviewer's corrections and The necessary corrections pointed out by the reviewer has been corrected by the authors and are highlighted in yellow colour
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>	