



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The manuscript is too long making it difficult to understand. In my opinion the most of phenomena described is well known, however the methodology applied is very interesting. Therefore the manuscript should be shortened concerning only the results of the application reaching one conclusion "The RVA was convenient for the simulation of thermal processing of solutions for MPPs".	We already agree that the manuscript is a little long in size, however all the discussion made about the physical phenomena is too important to be just deleted. In this sense, we believe that the maintenance of the manuscript in its previous form, despite the reviewer's comment, is important to achieve the conclusion which is the most important, about the RVA technique and its importance to understand the thermal processes of MPPs solutions.
Minor REVISION comments	Page 36, line 620 complete the sentence, please	We have done the suggested amendment.
Optional/General comments		