SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	**MS: 2012/AJEA/2177**
Title of the Manuscript:	**NATURE OF TOMATOES MICROFLORA UNDER STORAGE**

General guideline for Peer Review process: *(Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper / case reports)*

- *Is the problem/objective of this study original and important? SCIENCEDOMAIN international strongly opposes the practice of duplicate publication or any type of plagiarism. However, studies which are carried out to reconfirm / replicate the results of any previously published paper with new dataset, may be considered for publication. But these types of studies should have a 'clear declaration' of this matter. If you suspect any unethical practice in this manuscript, kindly write it in the report with some proof/links.*
- Materials & methods *(Kindly comment on the suitability and technical standards of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods/process should be provided so that another researcher is able to reproduce the experiments described)*
- Results & discussion (*Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant and current references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)*
- Conclusion *(Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only. Authors should provide adequate proof for their claims without overselling them*)
- Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?
- SDI believes in constructive criticism. Reviewers are encouraged to be honest but not offensive in their language. It is expected that the reviewer should suggest the authors on how they can strengthen their paper to make it acceptable. Comments of the reviewers should be sufficiently informative and helpful to reach a Editorial Decision. We strongly advise that a negative review should also explain the weaknesses of any manuscript, so that the concerned authors can understand the basis of rejection and he/she can improve the manuscript based on those comments. Authors also should not confuse straightforward and true comments with unfair criticism.
- We are very much reluctant to go against suggestions (particularly on technical areas) of the reviewers. Therefore, authors are requested to treat the suggestions of reviewers with utmost importance.
- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment **My recommendation is re-write and re-submit the MS, taking into account at least the following considerations.**	**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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	In this paper authors analyzed spoilage microorganism on raw and canned tomatoes. The main conclusion of this MS is that CFU (colony forming units) were lower in canned tomatoes than in control ones. However, according to data showed on table 1, similar results were found in all of them, since values ranging from 1 to 38 x 10^5 CFU/ml were found in canned tomatoes and from 10 to 21 10^5 CFU/ml in raw ones. Introduction section is very long, whit great amount of information no related with the aim of this paper. It should be shortened to ≈2 pages, providing information about microbial spoilage of fresh and canned tomatoes and the best canning technologies to be used to avoid this problem. In material and methods section no information is provided about the canning processing performed in the selected canned tomato samples, which is of great importance to comment the obtained results. No information is provided about the number of replicates used for each tomato canned or row sample or the number or determinations performed for each biochemical test or microbial count. No statistical analysis is provided to found differences among raw and canned tomatoes or along time from opening the can. The bacteria and fungi characterization (according to different microbiological test) is shown in tables 2 and 3, but it is not clear if those data were obtained from raw or from canned tomatoes.	

	Changes in some organoleptic quality parameters are shown on table 4, however no information about them is provided in material and methods section. Discussion section is poor and should be improved in deep.	
Minor REVISION comments	Check MS for English grammar and spelling.	
Optional/General comments	Some references are un-completed, such as those of lines 361, 366, 367, 378, 381, 383, 387, etc	

Thus, the MS, in its present form is not appropriated for publication in this journal.

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**María Serrano**
Department, University & Country	**Department of Applied Biology**