



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Applied Life Sciences International</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JALSI_34760
Title of the Manuscript:	Microbiological and Physicochemical Characteristics of Sheep Milk Heated with Charcoal, Gas and Microwave
Type of Article:	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>All the abbreviations should be written in an open-form at first use. There are still abbreviations with no open-form: TVB, LAB, TS...</p> <p>ABSTRACT Conclusion: The sentences included the results found by the authors, but it is still lacking the statement of what authors CONCLUDED from their results. As suggested before, my suggestion is to include sentences stating that the alternatives studied showed results which corroborate the initial hypothesis.</p> <p>INTRODUCTION In the revised manuscript, the authors stated that "In Sudan already gas is being used in rural areas because of harm that is made by using charcoal and in the future when electricity covers all areas microwave could be used, but this study is focusing on the alternative for charcoal specially gas". Consider to include this information in the introduction section.</p> <p>MATERIALS AND METHODS</p> <p>2.4 Determination of physicochemical characteristics of milk</p> <p>"Physicochemical characteristics (fat, protein, solids-non-fat and density)" – include the abbreviation SNF in the sentence, in order to allow the comprehension in the next citation.</p> <p>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</p> <p>3.1 Physicochemical and microbiological characteristics of milk heated with different sources of heat I apologize, but I am still not convinced that the discussion is done in a proper and efficient way. I reemphasize that it is lacking a real discussion based on the results, correlating the heat treatment and the changes observed in the physicochemical parameters.</p>	

SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

“The results disagree with those recorded by Aktar et al. [23] who showed that total solids content increased from 7.4% in fresh un-boiled milk to 10.39% in boiled milk.” The present study does not compare the total solids content before and after heat treatment, but among the different methods of heat treatment. The literature cited compared un-boiled and boiled milk. I cannot see how the authors results disagree with the presented results. There is no relation.

3.2 Effect of storage period on the quality of milk heated with charcoal, gas and microwave

“Dumuta-Codre et al. [24] reported a significant reduction of the colonies number of microflora as the microwave time exposure increased.” – The authors changed the sentence, but in this way, there is no relation with the reported results. The sentence has no link with the text. I suggest to remove it.

3.3 Identification of bacteria in sheep milk heated by gas, charcoal and microwave

The author deleted the sentence, but, in my opinion, it is still lacking some sentence about the authors conclusion concerning the identification of bacteria. What the implications of the presence of these genera identified?

CONCLUSION

In my opinion, the conclusion must be further improved considering the results found by the authors. The relevance of the sentences is ok, but it is lacking the relation with the results described.

GENERAL COMMENTS:

The authors believe the discussion was satisfactory. In my opinion, the simple comparison with other authors findings is not discussion. I still suggest to the authors to describe their results basing on the literature and discussing the meaning of these findings, the relevance for the field and the applicability of them.

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Maria Elisa Caetano-Silva</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Department of Food and Nutrition, Faculty of Food Engineering, University of Campinas, Brazil</i>