



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_30967
Title of the Manuscript:	SHELF LIFE STUDIES OF CAROTENOID PIGMENTS PRODUCED FROM RHODOTORULA MINUTA
Type of the Article	Full 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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The author should effect the typographical errors such as "upto" instead of "up to". Temperature values should be written well. E.g. "290C" should be written as "29°C". This error appeared a number of times in the manuscript and should be corrected accordingly. "Table 1 and 2" ought to be written as "Tables 1 and 2".	As per the reviewers comments I made corrections, incorporated updated references and all corrections highlighted in yellow colour.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The work is found relevant in Food and Industrial Microbiology especially in the area of search for suitable replacement of chemical food colourants which have been found to be associated with health implications.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_30967
Title of the Manuscript:	SHELF LIFE STUDIES OF CAROTENOID PIGMENTS PRODUCED FROM RHODOTORULA MINUTA
Type of the Article	Full 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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The author should effect the typographical errors such as "upto" instead of "up to". Temperature values should be written well. E.g. "290C" should be written as "29°C". This error appeared a number of times in the manuscript and should be corrected accordingly. "Table 1 and 2" ought to be written as "Tables 1 and 2".	As per the reviewers comments I made corrections, incorporated updated references and all corrections highlighted in yellow colour.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The work is found relevant in Food and Industrial Microbiology especially in the area of search for suitable replacement of chemical food colourants which have been found to be associated with health implications.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_30967
Title of the Manuscript:	SHELF LIFE STUDIES OF CAROTENOID PIGMENTS PRODUCED FROM RHODOTORULA MINUTA
Type of the Article	Full 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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The author should effect the typographical errors such as "upto" instead of "up to". Temperature values should be written well. E.g. "290C" should be written as "29°C". This error appeared a number of times in the manuscript and should be corrected accordingly. "Table 1 and 2" ought to be written as "Tables 1 and 2".	As per the reviewers comments I made corrections, incorporated updated references and all corrections highlighted in yellow colour.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The work is found relevant in Food and Industrial Microbiology especially in the area of search for suitable replacement of chemical food colourants which have been found to be associated with health implications.	