



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	2015_BMRJ_17960
Title of the Manuscript:	Microbiological quality of cows' milk butter processed in Khartoum State, Sudan
Type of the Article	Original Research 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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	The authors have to specify the number of analyzed samples for each treatments The subparagraph 2.4.1 in my opinion is too detailed In the tables the use of superscripts (upper and lower case) makes hard to read the results, I suggest to use a different method for highlighting statistical significant values	Thank you and the replicates of this experiment are stated in the materials and methods. With due respect to your opinion this subparagraph can not be further detailed. Again with due respect to your opinion I think to my information, no other means can be for explanation of statistical analysis
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The subparagraphs 2.4.2-2.4.7 may be included in a only subparagraph	I think separate subparagraphs are useful