



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 <i>(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)</i>
Compulsory REVISION comments	1) The English language of the manuscript should be deeply reviewed. The written English must be carefully revised in order to improve understanding the data and results of the manuscript. E.g. in Line 12 the word food appears 3 times. Line 37: Please, explain the correlation between diet and health. 2) No hypothesis was presented in the manuscript. What is the hypothesis? How to know if soursop is a good choice? 3) The objectives must be rewritten according to the hypothesis tested. The objectives in the study is "to test" the production of soursop 4) Materials and Methods: Line 52: Sterile water is distilled or deionized? Line 54: The cooling was fast? Please cite a reference for this protocol. Figure 1 should be deleted. No statistical analysis was made for Psop and Pcont treatments? Line 131: Specify the analytical methods for crude protein, crude fat, crude fiber, ash and carbohydrate content 5) Results Improve the quality of Figure 2.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Figure 4: pH = 0? Please, explain.	
	Section 3.4: The description of results is redundant with Table 2.	
	6) Conclusions must be improved.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Marcela Bianchessi da Cunha-Santino</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Department of Hydrobiology , Universidade Federal de São Carlos (UFSCar), Brazil</i>