



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Annual Research &amp; Review in Biology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_47598
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Different Essential Oils on the Shelf Life of Concentrated Yogurt
Type of the 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Concentrations of PS and EO should be clarified throughout the study. The concentrations of EO seem to change randomly, sometimes 150 and sometimes 250 ppm (ug/Kg). See abstract (250), but methods 2.1 (150), and the change can be also detected among the different Tables. The concentration of EO used in all series should be unified. Otherwise, results are not comparative. Provided that authors propose the use of 250 ug/Kg for supplementing potassium sorbate, organoleptic properties should be tested at 250 ug/Kg. Otherwise, the value of the study is greatly reduced.</p> <p>Lines 151-52: "When EOs were compared, the best EO to be used to control S. aureus were: wheat germ oil followed by clove oil and cinnamon oil". According to Table 4, this is so after 6 weeks, but the variations after each week show important deviations. In previous weeks, wheat germ oil is not the best, and any simple statement should be taken with caution. Discussion about that this needed. By the way, some EO. are not preservative at all in comparison with P.S. In fact, there is no series using EO without any addition of P.S. at Table 4 (but these series are included at Table 5). At Table 5 (molds), almond sweet oil and cedar wood oil are mentioned as the most effective EO (lines 160-61), but clove oil should also be mentioned. In general, simple details about the best EO should be revised (lines mentioned, or conclusion), looking trends rather than particular values at one particular week. There should be significant experimental errors and variations.</p> <p>About organoleptic properties, Table 6, results are rather poor. According to line 198, the sesame oil is the EO with lower effects on these properties, but this EO is not chosen as effective as preservative. Otherwise, the amount of EO. used in these series is 150, so that 250 ug/Kg would be worse. Finally, the change in the organoleptic properties is not surely a negative effect, as some EO. gives a tasty flavor for some people. These points should also be discussed.</p> <p>Conclusion should agree with the results. New compounds or EO that are not studied should not appear at conclusion. Eucaliptus oil is amended at the conclusion, but this EO has not been used at all in the study. Natamycin and sodium benzoate are also mentioned exclusively at the conclusion. This is not accepted. Delete and re-write conclusion.</p>	<p>We have changed this in the whole manuscript.</p> <p>We have modified the conclusion.</p> <p>We have modified the conclusion.</p> <p>We deleted Eucaliptus oil from the manuscript.</p> <p>Natamycin and sodium benzoate were also deleted.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>English should be edited.</p> <p>The Latin name of microorganisms should be always written in italics (i.e. Staphylococcus aureus and many others at different sections and paragraphs)</p> <p>Potassium sorbate is not a synthetic preservative, but a salt or chemical preservative. Delete the word synthetic.</p>	English correction has been done.
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>The study is rather confirmatory of previous reports. The discussion about similar previous results should be translated to a final discussion. Some comments are introduced too early (i.e the paragraph about microbial counts after EO addition, lines 123-126 or the comments about the most effective EO appears before Table 3. Table 3 should display the results, and then the comments should be discussed. In general, the manuscript should be re-ordered. Moreover, data discussed at paragraph lines 127-137 do not reconcile with Table 3. 13.00 is not lower than 13.00. I think that 101 means <math>10^{-1}</math> in some cases. A general revision for eliminating the relative messy of the text would improve the manuscript.</p>	

**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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	