



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2012 BJASt 2541
Title of the Manuscript:	QUALITY AND SHELF - LIFE ASSESSEMENT OF VARIOUSLY PROCESSED CATFISH AND TILAPIA STORED AT AMBIENT TEMPERATURE

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- 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	L. 11-30, In Introduction, I didn't find any descriptions about the samples, catfish and Tilapia. It should be described more detail as related to the purpose of this study. L. 34, What kind of fishes should be mentioned here in detail, included species, weight and size... L. 45-48, For the smoked treatment, What is the processing method and the moisture content of the product? L. 55-60, The odour, flavour, and texture of processed fish were evaluated. However, taste instead of flavour was mentioned in L. 94. I don't understand how the authors could transfer these three items to freshness. I didn't find any descriptions in the manuscript. L. 104-105, "it can be assumed that...air". Why the authors could assumed that? L. 106-107, What is the content of the magnesium chloride as impurities in the salt the authors used? L. 112, 124, 133, 152, 167, "significant" term existed. However, I didn't see the used statistic method in the manuscript. L. 113-116, Chrysichthysnigrodigitatus ...the content of 0.1-0.9%(Love 1988). I suggest that the authors should provide the lipids content of this two fishes	<i>Chrysichthys nigrodigitatus</i> and <i>Tilapia zillii</i>, two common fresh water fish species readily available and with high commercial value in Nigeria. Life fish with average weights of $250 \pm 15\text{g}$ were obtained from fishermen. Moisture content of $15 \pm 5\%$. Individual scores for odour, flavor and texture were added to obtain the total sensory score. Moisture can only come from the atmosphere during storage. Cooking salt was used. MgCl content was not determined Correction has been made in the manuscript Existing literature classifies <i>Chrysichthys nigrodigitatus</i> as fatty(Udo, 2012). Its lipid content was not determined.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	used in this study. L. 168-170, The slightly higher....processing process. What is the evidence for the authors to assume this reason? L. 203- 240, References should be corrected and rearranged to fit the style of the Journal. Besides, Twelve cited papers in the manuscript were wrong or not listed in the references. In Table 1. Why the contents of trace metal in three processed fishes were almost equal? How many samples were analysed in the study?	SMKD samples had higher trace metal contents. The difference when compared with OVD and BOVD samples was however not significant. Corrections have been made in the manuscript.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	L. 30, Wrong sentence. L. 71, What is the conditions? L. 76=77, What are the N1 and N2? L. 192-193, The optimum storage period... 4-5 weeks. I don't think the term "optimum" in here is proper. For the figures, I suggest the authors should not combine two figures as "Figure 2&3". The way like Figure 2, including a & b, is acceptable. Besides, the title should be rewritten.	?? Figures have been seperated
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	L. 74, I don't understand why dried here? L. 80-81, Reagents....analysis. Is this correct?	