



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Food Science Journal |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AFSJ_50253 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Effect of P ^H and Sugar level on Heat Resistance of <i>Escherichia Coli</i> in Sweet Orange Juice (<i>Citrius Sinensis</i>). |
| 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 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Refer to the guideline for citation in the text and referencing. 2. Cite the graphs in the text. | It has been corrected by us. We totally agreed with all your suggestions. Thanks |
| Minor REVISION comments | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Line 37, use increasingly for increasing. 2. Section 2.3.1, remove 'Determination of' from the topic. 3. Line 74, use was for were. 4. Line 85, it should be table 1-6. 5. Line 88, write the name of researcher that is cited within parenthesis. write before citation and manage such throughout the manuscript. 6. Line 88, use that instead of the. 7. Line 95-99, divide the sentence. 8. Line 117, add and before 4. | <p>Increasingly</p> <p>2 It has been removed</p> <p>3 Was</p> <p>Table 1-6</p> <p>Corrected</p> <p>That corrected</p> <p>CORRECTED</p> <p>DONE</p> |
| Optional/General comments | | This work was carried out in collaboration between all authors. 'Author A' designed the study, performed the statistical analysis, wrote the protocol, and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. 'Author B' and 'Author C' managed the analyses of the study. 'Author C' managed the literature searches. All authors read and approved the final manuscript |

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? | <p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p> | <p>No ethical issues. This work was carried out in collaboration between all authors. 'Author A' designed the study, performed the statistical analysis, wrote the protocol, and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. 'Author B' and 'Author C' managed the analyses of the study. 'Author C' managed the literature searches. All authors read and approved the final manuscript</p> |