

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_125121
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of antibacterial activity of milk peptides released during the growth of lactobacilli in milk
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The work is very relevant as the lactobacillus is known as GRAS bacteria and it produces many antibacterial peptides hvind bacteriocidal effect on many gram positive and gram negative bacteria. This work will add the knowledge to this area of study	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	ok	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Abstract is comprehensive and informative	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Subsections are Ok but no figure of antibacterial activity is given on graphs and tables?	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I suggested that some pics of antibacterial activity must be included as the whole paper based on its activity only graphs are	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Work will be more informative if more recent references will be added	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	ok	
Optional/General comments	Work is good but more recent references and antibacterial Discs could be added to make it effective	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sabiha Imran
Department, University & Country	Manav Rachna International Institute of Research and Studies, India