



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	The introduction section is very brief while the content of the paper is quite rich. Hence, it will be fine if you could make review of the available literature based in Brazil or elsewhere in the world and enrich the introductory section. Review of the whole paper is recommended to keep the standard and consistency in writing of citation throughout the manuscript. In addition we have to indicate the Model equation .	We are providing some more comments in Introduction, mainly according other reviewers, together with some more recent literature based on milk protein investigations.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	On the Topic, I would suggest the following changes/inclusions highlighted in yellow: STUDY OF THE BEHAVIOR OF DAIRY/milk PROTEINS IN/at DIFFERENT CONDITIONS OF THERMAL PROCESSING USING CHEMOMETRIC APPROACH, BRAZIL On the abstract; check that ratio has no unit. On Line 42, correction on the reference (BOOTH and BASON, 2007) In the section on the MATERIALS AND METHODS, Check the following minor corrections: Line 70, Bennett <i>et al.</i> (2007) Line 87. Check repeated sentence 'without prior	We are changing the title of the manuscript according to others reviewers comments. We have done all the suggested amendments. Line 70, it was modified. Line 87. it was modified. Line 198, it was modified. Line 210, it was modified. Line 214, it was modified. Line 345, it was modified.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<i>hydration'</i> Line 198, Correlation Coefficient (CC): should be replaced by r Line 210, (SCHUCK <i>et al.</i>, 1994). Line 214, BHASKAR <i>et al.</i>, 2001) Line 345, insolubilized, look for better word/precipitated Line 371, table 8 Line 466, 477, 489, figura should be corrected as Figure Line 490-491 minutos should be corrected to minute	Line 371, it was modified. Line 466, 477, 489, it was modified. Line 490-49,1 it was modified.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper is quite informative and I have enjoyed reading the manuscript. The comments indicated above should be included before posting.	We acknowledge the reviewer general comment.