



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ EJNFS_44097
Title of the Manuscript:	Bio-preservative activities of partially purified bacteriocin extracts of <i>Lactobacillus mindensis</i> TMW and <i>Lactobacillus tuccei</i> CECT 5920 isolated from Nigerian fermented foods
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	Line 97: "patially purified bacteriocin extract" – partially ? Line 98: "cell free supernatant" – How this supernatant was obtained? Line 104: When the LAB isolates were inoculated in MRS broth? Because according to line 81, the isolates were maintained in MRS Agar Lines 179-180: The samples of fish and meat were raw material? Line 188-189: The finial microbial cell count was determined in Mannitol salt Agar and McConkey Agar? Please specify in which topic you have already mentioned. Line 194: Please compare the nominal values of each quantitative analysis to determine if there was statistical difference between the samples. Results: Please express the values of effect of temperature, pH, salt concentration, storage time, spices and antimicrobial activity with the statistical comparison between the values obtained to determine if there was significant difference or not. Lines 430-431: Text is confusing. Lines 432-433: "were in agreement with almost each and every study" – the reference for "every study" is only 1 research. Lines 445- 453: Needs proofreading. Line 518: "However" shows disagreement to the previous context but it seems to corroborate with it.	Line 97: "Partially" has been inserted Line 98: The method for obtaining the supernatant has been included in the manuscript Line 104: The LAB were stored on MRS agar Lines 179-180: yes Lines 188-189: This has been corrected in the manuscript Line 194: The standard deviation of the values were used Lines 430-431: The test has been edited and corrected Lines 432-433: "was in agreement" has been used since the result was compared with one author. Lines 445-453: This section has been corrected Line 518: "However" has been removed since both sentences corroborated each other
Minor REVISION comments	Introduction – use more recent citation - Line 47 – 49: "The interest in the application of LAB and their metabolites in the prevention of the food spoilage and the extension of the shelf life of foods have increased during the last decade (Stiles, 1996)" – Last decade refers to the year 1996, so this information has more than 30 years. - Search for recent studies that applied this bacteriocins in food protection. Lines 434-435: The production of organic acids only was checked? Lines 437-440: The first sentence is regarding to "genera" however the second sentence is referring to some specific species - lack of coherence. More cohesion between paragraphs on discussion. Compare results obtained with more researches.	This section has been correction Lines 44-435: "Production of organic acids" has been edited since this was not specifically monitored in the work. Lines 437-440: there is a relationship between "genera" and "species" as used in the text as shown in Table 1. The flow of the paragraphs on discussion has been improved to enhance understanding
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

--	--	--