



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_47719
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of Volatile Compounds in Probiotic Yogurt During Storage Through Solid-Phase Microextraction Gas Chromatography
Type of the Article	RESEARCH

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>)

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>THE PRESENT MANUSCRIPT EVALUATES PARAMETERS OF EXTRACTION OF VOLAITE COMPOUNDS FROM CONVENTIONAL AND PROBIOTIC YOGURT. The manuscript is clear, concise and very useful for the scientific community. It is not a fully method development but an optimization of extraction methodology of volatiles by SPME.</p> <p>Temperature, time and salt are the variables of the extraction procedure. Methods are sufficiently detailed and references are correct.</p> <p>Regarding results, there is a question on the number of quantified compounds. Only 5 compounds are reported, and acetaldehyde and other relevant compounds in fermented milks are not reported in the study. I wonder if the authors are not reporting compounds under a certain concentration and for what reason.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	The authors would better report microbial counts on log cfu given that sub and super indexes are lost and wrong/odd values for counts are reported on the manuscript. Please check the use of italics for scientific names: line 40, line 195, line 300 and so on	
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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Esther Sendra
Department, University & Country	Universidad Miguel Hernández de Elche, Spain