



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_15372
Title of the Manuscript:	STUDY OF THE BEHAVIOR OF DAIRY PROTEIN IN DIFFERENT CONDITIONS OF THERMAL PROCESSING USING CHEMOMETRIC APPROACH
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	(1) Page 13/37, Table 7: The peak, retention and final viscosity of MPC1 shows the lowest values compared to the other five samples. Explain this observation.	We have added a phrase about that in the new version of the manuscript
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	(1) Page 20/37, line 351-352: “The first is the physical stress to which the solutions are subjected during the whole time of analysis” I suggest that the results be plotted graphically to indicate the variation of stress with time of experiment. In this way, the critical time for the protein structure to lose its ability to interact with water can be obtained. (2) Page 20/37, line 361-362: “During the cooling step, another common effect to various tests was substantial increase in viscosity...”. How does the rate of cooling affect the increase in viscosity?	We agree with the reviewer's comment, however we have already a larger number of tables and figures, we believe that the text is illustrative about the point we are addressing. We believe that the present form of the text is really clear in terms of an explanation about the question raised by the reviewer, and we maintained the original text in the new version of the manuscript.