SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_EJNFS_35415**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Investigation of bacteria associated with the spoilage zobo drink fortified with Scent leaf and Ginger**
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/journal/30/editorial-policy)

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	**1. Were there any nutritional signs (criteria) of spoilage in the fortified and not fortified samples?** **2. There was pronounced bacteriostatic effect in the samples ZGE and ZSE (Table 1). GE inhibited growth of PV while SE inhibited growth of SA (Table 3). Why GE and SE were not tested in combination and the strict conclusion that "ginger as well as scent leaf may not be suitable to curtail the spoilage" (Abstract) was put forward?** **3. Why a potential "spoilage effect" of fungi (including yeast) was not studied?** **4. How can one be sure that all types of contaminating bacteria were picked up from the colonies?**	1. this paper is a report of a portion of the findings of a wide range research into the Bio-preservative potentials of ginger and scent leaf in zobo drink. 2. in Nigeria, local producers of zobo drinks usually adopt only one 'presumed preservative agent.' However, we will look into combining different plants used for this purpose in the on-going research. Thanks. 3. Extensive but unpublished research had been carried out on this aspect by one of the authors which forms part of her yet to be defended thesis for the award of a degree. Therefore, we do not want to go against the rule of her department. 4. all colonies showing any form of differences were diligently isolated for identification
Minor REVISION comments	1. Abstract (l. 14-17). Text correction is needed. 2. Experimental design. (l. 99) What sweeteners and flavourings were added? 3. Identification of Isolates. (l.122-123). Language needs correction. 4. Microbiological Analysis. (l.115-117). Reagent manufacturers must be indicated. 5. Table 1. What do super scripts a,b,c,d mean?	1. correction has been made 2. the name of the sweetener and flavour has been added 3. correction has been effected 4. Name of the manufacturer has been given. 5. the superscripts has been explained
Optional/General comments		