



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	

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. The results in tables and figures must not be repeated. 2. In the Introduction section (page 3, line 11): The phrase has to be revised because it's very unclear. 3. In the Materials and methods section (page 4, line 13): How was the absorbance measured (using what type of apparatus)? 4. In the Results section (page 4, line 18): The day of measurement and the table with results are not mentioned in the text. Some of the results in the text don't correspond with the results in the tables: for example on page 4, line 18 – 82.5 % in the text, 82 % in Table 1; page 4, line 19 – 24 % in the text, 26 % according to Table 1; page 4, line 21 – 12 % in the text, 9 % according to Table 1; page 5, line 2 – 67 % in the text, 68 % according to Table 2; page 5, line 3 – 24 % in the text, 25 % according to Table 2; page 5, line 4 – 24 % in the text, 26 % according to Table 2; page 5, line 4 – 10 % in the text, 16 % according to Table 2, etc. There are many discrepancies in the results cited in the text and those presented in tables. The authors must verify all results.	Thanks for the comments. And it helped me to improve and check my articles once gain. And gone through the results and rectified the mistakes in the text with the table results. Incorporated the recent references pertaining to my article.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Page 1, line 2: The abbreviation MYEB isn't explained. 2. Page 2, line 8: The reference Dowman in the manuscript is cited as Downham in the References section. Which one is correct? When the authors of the manuscript are two, it has to be cited as Dowman and Collins, 2000. 3. Page 3, line 7: Kaur (2009) has to be cited as Kaur et al. (2000) in the text, because the authors of the manuscript are three. 4. Page 3, line 11: Latha (2010) has to be cited as Latha and Jeevaratnam (2010), because the authors of the manuscript are two.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Page 1, line 22: The degree is missing.	