Response to reviewers’ comments

Dear Editor,

Please see attached the new version of our manuscript “Natural Red Pigment Production by Monascus purpureus in Submerged Fermentation Systems Using a Food Industry Waste: Brewer’s Spent Grain”, with corrections based on the reviewer’s minor revision comments.

A detailed response to each comment is presented below.

Authors believe that corrections have improved the quality of the manuscript and we hope this new version is suitable for publication in Foods Journal.

Sincerely yours,

Yekta Goksungur, on behalf of all authors
Response to reviewers' comments:

**Reviewer #2:**

- **Title**

  “Monascus purpureus needs italics”

  The authors agree with the reviewer. Title is corrected as demanded.

- **Abstract**

  “Line 17.‘‘..was achieved...’’.""

  The authors agree with the reviewer. The correction made.

- **Introduction**

  “The Introduction section could be flourished by the incorporation of the health benefits of the Monascus pigments, claimed by the authors at conclusion.”

  The authors agree with the reviewer. The health benefits of the pigments was added to the Introduction section as requested (Line 34)

  “Line 42.’‘...in the literature’’."

  The authors agree with the reviewer. The correction was made.

  “Line 63.’‘...in different solid medium:...’’.’’

  The authors agree with the reviewer. The sentence was changed to “in different solid(BSG): liquid(dilute sulfuric acid) ratios” Solid: BSG, liquid: dilute sulfuric acid

  “Line 84.’‘..the standard method 2540’’."

  The authors appreciate the correction. Missing article “the” was added to the sentence. The correction was made.

  “Line 88.’‘The powder was directly placed...’’.’’

  The authors agree with the reviewer. Missing article “the” was added to the sentence. The correction was made.

  “Line 89.’‘..having a good...’’."

  The authors agree with the reviewer. Missing article “a” was added to the sentence.

  “Line 90. A dot is needed after the word ‘‘sample’’. Then the text could be read as: Four spectra of samples...’’."
The authors appreciate the correction. The sentence was corrected as requested.

“Line 118. Change ‘‘are’’ to ‘‘were’’, ‘‘..were considered...’’.”

The authors agree with the reviewer. The correction was made as claimed.

-Results and Discussion

“Line 154. The comma is not needed: ‘‘Carvalheiro et al.[20]...’’.”

The authors agree with the reviewer. The correction was made as requested.

“Line 166. Change ‘‘can also be observed’’ to ‘‘were observed’’.”

The authors appreciate the correction. The sentence was corrected as requested.

“Line 209. ‘‘In addition, the low pigment production....showed low...’’.”

The authors agree with the reviewer. The sentence was corrected as (Line 228): “In addition, low pigment production (3.07 UA500) was observed in BSG medium hydrolyzed with 1% (w/v) sulfuric acid.”

“Line 244. ‘‘In the present study,...’’.”

The authors agree with the reviewer. Missing article “the” was added to the sentence. The correction was made.

“Lines 306-307. Change ‘‘which was also stated’’ to ‘‘and has been documented by many authors’’.”

The authors appreciate the correction. The sentence was corrected as claimed.

“Line 344. ‘‘...which affect the pigment formation...’’.”

The authors agree with the reviewer. The sentence was corrected as requested.

“Line 354. ‘‘, while afterwards was decreased’’.”

The authors appreciate the correction. The sentence was corrected as requested.

“Line 365. ‘‘...and conditions used during fermentation’’.”

The authors appreciate the correction. The sentence was corrected as requested.

-Figure 4

“The authors could provide Figure 4 with error bars.”

The authors agree with the reviewer. Error bars were added to Figure 4 as requested.
“Line 375.” ..and then it was declined.”

The authors appreciate the correction. The sentence was corrected as requested.

“Line 381.” ..was slightly decreased.”

The authors agree with the reviewer. The sentence was corrected as requested.