



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Chemical Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_ACSj_14943
Title of the Manuscript:	Determination and comparison of physico-chemical properties of home-made juices in Lesotho and commercial juice available in the local markets
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 <i>(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)</i>
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. The materials and methods should be subdivided further as : 2.1 Materials and 2.2 Methods. 2. Under methods, the analyses carried out must be distinctively separated e.g. 2.2.1 PH; 2.2.1 Total acidity etc 3. Under Results and Discussion, the word determination should be removed from lines 98 and 118	2.1 Sample collection and storage 2.2 Analysis of physico-chemical properties 2.3 Analysis of nutritional properties Regarding the sub-sections i.e. 2.2.1, etc, I would like to differ, that would create too long document unnecessarily while there is nothing new to the existing body of knowledge. It it lines 87 and 118 that contain the word 'determination', these have been changed to accordingly and highlighted as advised!
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		