



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/BJAST/2213
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE STUDY ON THE EFFICACY OF SOME PLANT AQUEOUS EXTRACTS AND WAXES IN THE PRESERVATION OF SOME FRUITS AND FRUIT VEGETABLES

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	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	Authors must improve the introduction section, justifying the need of the specific studied postharvest techniques, previous work in the area must be considered to justify the advances in the knowledge. M&M: this section should be reconsidered and re-planned, authors are urge to read related papers on post harvest treatments of fruit and vegetables and as possible must try to emulate the general methodologies to describe the maturity of the studied fruits, it is needed to be more objectives in reporting the ripening stages considering that the obtained results will vary according to this stage. The experimental design must be fortified, authors should include more replicates in the studied fruits and vegetables, in addition more controls must be included considering the wax treatment at high temperature, the high temperature can affect the postharvest of f&V in this case authors need to assure that observed effect is attributed to the waxes and not to the temperature. Authors should consider the importance of applying the treatments as close to the industry does, the more practical possible way. The shelf life study must be stronger, authors should describe the considerations to declare a produce as spoiled, any hedonic scale, fungal decay, wilting decay, overall decay, and if possible microbiological analysis, changes in the physicochemical analysis,	Previous works (Pao <i>et al.</i> 1999; Bukar and Magashi 2008, Bukar <i>et al.</i> 2010) were included in the introduction section Results earlier presented were means of three replications This is a preliminary work just to observe the effect of hurdle technology (waxing, buffer and high temperature). The dipping method (used this research) was earlier reported by Pao <i>et al.</i> 1999. Visual observation on a scale of 5 (see text) in addition to growth of microorganisms was adopted (further research would look at suggestions offered)



SDI Review Form 1.6

	sensorial changes in flavour, colour, odour. Results, seems well described, but as stated in the M&M they are enough to sustain the efficacy of the treatments. A more relevant discussion is needed, author should compare the efficacy of the treatments with previous works, explaining the obtained results, highlighting differences and similarities, this will make a more relevant discussion. The used references must be more updated, avoid citing unpublished works.	Discussion enriched by comparing past reports by authors 1 Unpublished work now removed from the list
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Check the spelling of the title and the abstract is hard to read	Corrected
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The studied topic is trendy and deserves study	This work is still a preliminary work more research would be designed to corroborate the findings