



Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_3524
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploration and Purification of Secondary Metabolites from Lactobacillus acidophilus and Their Potential as a Bio-preservative
Type of the Article	

General guideline:

This journal believes that no manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of 'lack of Novelty', provided the manuscript is sufficiently robust and technically sound. Too often a journal's decision to publish a paper is dominated by what the Editor/reviewer think is interesting and will gain greater readership - both of which are subjective judgments and lead to decisions which are frustrating and delay the publication. This journal will rigorously peer-review your submissions and publish all papers that are judged to be technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://mbimph.com/index.php/UPJOZ/editorial-policy>)



1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's feedback
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</p> <p>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</p> <p>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient</p>	<p>Yes. The need to search for biobased materials as preservative is critical in the present era .</p> <p>The title of the paper is adequate but the abstract is not concise and needs to reflect the methodology and the corresponding outcome of the research paper.</p> <p>The paper is scientifically correct but the author didn't specify the portion or the particular bio preservatives being utilised, is it bacteriocin or organic acid or hydrogen peroxide?</p> <p>The references at the reference section need rearrangement, why is the year of publication not listed immediately after the names of authors? The results of the findings in biopreservation are too scanty, the author should compare and contrast the effect of the different compounds used for preservation, chemicals and organic metabolites. Pictures alone can't explain the effects</p> <p>Similarly, the discussion didn't compare the work with previous studies on the subject. Recent journals should be used to write the discussion.</p>	<p>Thank you for valuable comments, response has been done.</p>



<p>and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>		
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p>	<p>Rephrase the abstract The article should be accepted with the minor corrections put in the article</p>	<p>Thank you for the valuable comments, Response has been done accordingly.</p>
<p><u>Optional</u> comments</p>		

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