



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_32954
Title of the Manuscript:	Production and Properties of Probiotic Soursop Juice using <i>Pediococcus pentosaceus</i> LBF2 as Starter
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	In the introduction Line 12 - The word <u>foods</u> appears three times. It should be replaced for products so as not to get repeated. Line 14/15 - ... it represents over 65% of the 15 functional food market [3]. These data are old, from 2005, and should be updated. In general, the citations / references used in the introduction are old and should be updated. There are recent studies such as Martins et al. (2015) and Martins et al. (2013) that can be cited in the second paragraph. MARTINS, E. M. F.; RAMOS, A. M.; MARTINS, M. L.; RODRIGUES, M. Z. Research and development of probiotic products from vegetable bases: A New Alternative for Consuming Functional Food. In: RAI, V. R.; BAI, J. A. (Eds.). Beneficial Microbes in Fermented and Functional Foods. Boca Raton, London: CRC Press. 1. ed., 2015, p. 207-223. MARTINS, E. M. F.; RAMOS, A. M.; VANZELA, E. S. L.; STRINGHETA, P. C.; PINTO, C. L. de O.; MARTINS, J. M. Products of vegetable origin: A new alternative for the consumption of probiotic bacteria. Food Research International, n. 51, p. 764-770, 2013. In the Materials and Methods Line 53 - "using a pasteurizer" should be excluded. Done Lines 60 and 65: ml, is the letter L not uppercase? Like mL. This should be reviewed throughout the text. Done	Done



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Lines 69-74: Figure 1 is not called in the text. It should be called in 2.2. Done Line 104: Format "forming the unit (CFU)." Done Line 122: Sensory evaluation does not submit to the ethics committee. Is this not asked by the journal? I don't understand Line 130: In what times were these analyzes carried out? It should be show. duplicate In Results and Discussion Line 135: The step involved in the production of probioticated juice samples is shown in Figure 1. This should be taken to 2.2. Done Line 142, figure 2: viability should be presented in Log of CFU / mL. Done Line 188: Correct the sentence: "Decrease in pH in the beginning of fermentation is of great importance"---> Decrease in pH in the beginning of fermentation had a great importance. Done Line 207/208: There were no significant differences ($P \leq 0.05$) should be corrected. ($P > 0.05$). Done Line 209-210: However there was significant ($P \leq 0.05$) difference in the color of the Pcont samples with the lowest color value obtained at the 4th week of storage. Why did this happen? It must be explained. Done See line 211 -213 Line 222/223: adding equal letters in the same line does not differ etc. it was done column by column not row by row Conclusion Line 269: "and were strongly accepted". Can you say that for all the	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	samples? And the control treatment? It should be reviewed. Done	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The article is interesting, but corrections are necessary. ethical issues: Yes. Sensory evaluation does not submit to the ethics committee. They should submit to the ethics committee. Is this not asked by the journal? If not, okay.	