

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_115274
Title of the Manuscript:	Enzymatic modification of milk proteins of cow milk, buffalo milk and goat milk and its effect on anti oxidant activity, digestibility of protein hydrolysates and bioactive peptides
Type of the Article	Original

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are sub-sections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>yes, so far it should undergo review as it is undergoing now, and after which it is welcomed in the Scientific community.</p> <p>It is okay, but I suggest that if the repetition of milk on the three animals is deleted, it will be better of. That is; Enzymatic modification of milk proteins of cow , buffalo and goat and its effect on anti oxidant activity, digestibility of protein hydrolysates and bioactive peptides</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>No. The sub-sections should be merged as already shown in the review to have a block format report.</p> <p>It is not correct as it is, but if the reviewer's comments 1, 2 ,3 and 4 are effected, it will become better.</p> <p>The research size made the references sufficiently okay, but references numbers 2, 8 and 18 could not be seen in the manuscript. Also, references numbers,3,14, 20, 25, 26 and 28 were represented in writing and numbering. We should use only numbering. Finally, references Laemmli, 1976 and Bradford, 1976 never appeared in the references section but on the manuscript only.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>It is okay, after all, English is a second language of the Author (s).</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The Author (s) should be welcomed with open arms and put under mentorship with the supervision of generous older Scientist (s).</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Michael Olisa Nwankwo
Department, University & Country	Joseph Sarwuan Tarka University, Nigeria