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## PART 1: Review Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer’s comment</th>
<th>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)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|**Compulsory REVISION comments**| Line 63, sec 2.1: how samples were prepared?  
Line 73: “Nutrient Agar was inoculated ....”? revise sentence  
Line 84: At what temperature incubation was done?  
Line 95: The heading should be “proximate composition” instead of “biochemical analysis”.  
Line 125: How can be the moisture content of any drink is 2%?  
Line 130: Acidity is 3.5%? Isn't it too acidic? Could it be advisable to look at food standards?  
Table 3: Re-check the pH and acidity values of all the samples.  
Line 172: Does that mean spoiled samples were collected from the market for study?  
Line 186-187: “This may be attributed.....” doesn't justify your reason for high protein content.|
|**Minor REVISION comments**| Line 32: sentence revision required  
Lines 69,70: sentence revision required  
Line 76: revise sentence  
Line 163: CO², write 2 as subscript  
Line 164: sentence revision |
|**Optional/General comments**| This is a good comprehensive report, the methodology is painstakingly thorough. I find no fault whatsoever with the methods but data analysis and conclusions require certain changes. Consideration of my comments will, I believe, lead to an improved report that will better illustrates the key concepts and conclusions.|
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