

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">European Journal of Nutrition &amp; Food Safety</a>
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	Research 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

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (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.	Manuscript is not defining introduction properly. Title and work is not matching. Material of requirement is missing.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is not describing work. Author should modify the title.	
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.	YES , In Introduction part author is talking about methods part and gave emphasis on methods. He/She should add importance or talk about novelty.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes	
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.	Manuscript is showing role of microbial peptide against pathogenic microbes, the only drawback is link missing in between topic and methods.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	references are not sufficient add some more relevant references in manuscript	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<b>needed revision</b>	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Author should gave emphasis on work plan and material and methods . Future plan is missing. Needed major revision. introduction and abstract are having no similarity .	

#### PART 2:

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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:	Vandana Bharti
Department, University & Country	North Eastern Hill University Shillong, India