



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_53215
Title of the Manuscript:	Bio-preservation of foods: a review
Type of the Article	Review 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/journal/30/editorial-policy>



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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Although the work is described as “an overview of the current scenario on bio-preservative compounds that are either actually being used industrially or under research and development stage” (at the end of the introduction), the bibliography is not actualized: 72 % has more than 10 years of have been published. Since the topic is effectively in continuous research and development, more recent scientific evidence is needed. - There is bibliography cited in the text but not listed at the end (Jay, 2012) and vice versa, (Albarracin et al., 2012, Tapsell et al., 2006 and Jey, 1998). - The writing is not according to a work to be published in a scientific journal: colloquial terms or not appropriate to technical language (tremendously; apt use; as per, ...), words repeated in the same sentence ("Preservatives preserve", etc.), words translated incorrectly ("now a day", instead of "nowadays", ...), grammatical errors ("it aid" instead of "it aids"; "a inhibitor" instead of "an inhibitor"). - Wrong written names of microorganisms and words: "micro-organisms", "micro biota", Saccharomyces is not italicized; <i>Streptococcus thermophilus</i>: without "ll"; <i>Enterococcus faecalis</i>: it is <i>faecalis</i>; <i>Klebsiella pneumoniae</i>: it is <i>pneumoniae</i>; peptidoglycan: it is peptidoglycan; “gm” instead of “mg.”, "tisdysgalacticin": this term does not exist, it is "dysgalacticin". - Acronyms: the acronym GRAS is known as "Generally recognized as safe" not "Generally regarded as safe" as it is mentioned in the work. On the other hand, "MIC" is mentioned without clarifying it meaning. - Lack of coherence is observed in the following sentences: “The increasing demand of natural food additives as an alternate to the chemical preservatives, essential oils (Eos) are more used under the concept of hurdle technology with other food preservatives” “Oxidized terpenoids as well as some aged essential oils known for organoleptic alterations, viscosity changes and even some skin sensitizing capacities (Woeber and Krombach 1969; Hagvall and others 2008; Skold and others 2008; Brared-Christensson and others 2010)” “A study conducted to stabilize meat cubes and minced meat with salt and glucose by process of fermentation by using culture of <i>Lactobacillus casei</i>, <i>Lactobacillus plantarum</i> and <i>Lactococci lactis</i>.” “The research work conducted to study impact of sucrose solution on strawberry for three months at 15 days interval each”. - In table 1: Meghrous et al. (1999) reference does not mention the activity of nisin against <i>Streptococcus thermophilus</i>. In the same way, Rodriguez et al. (2002) does not refer neither pediocin activity nor microorganisms mentioned. - Conceptual errors are observed in the following expressions: “The natural food preservatives preserve the food by adjusting temperature, lowering the pH value, altering water activity (a_w) and settling the redox potential of the product.” “Vinegar is a liquid solution and one of the most typical pickling agents with 5%-10% acetic acid and it preserves food by anaerobic fermentation.” 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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:	Davies, Cristina Verónica
Department, University & Country	National University of Entre Ríos, Argentina