



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012_BJAST_2873
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of different plastic liners on the quality of fresh-cut Jew's mallow leaves (<i>Corchorus olitorius</i> L.) during storage under different temperatures

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	Line 17: Include conclusion and recommendation in the Abstract Line 64: There is no optimization done as indicated. The data collected can also not be optimized. Line 72 -83: The content given is not just materials as per section 2.1. Line 76-77: Give the manufacturers specifications of the two types of packages used. Line 80: Explain and justify why only the two temperatures given were selected for testing Line 82: If two different fridges were used the show how the data obtained was standardized. Line 86-102: What is given as Methods is completely not clear. It should detailed on exactly what was done or standard SI methods referenced. Justify also why only the given quality parameters were chosen. Give the control experiment for the work done. Line111-117: Give the allowable weight loss or optimal value. Figure 1: What is Q2? Weeks? Line 127-132: Give the allowable or optimal value. Discuss in detail the results for week1 to 4. Figure 2: Give the allowable or optimal value. Discuss in detail the results for week1 to 4. Figure 3: The the allowable or optimal value. Discuss also results for week3 and 4. Line 185-187: Discuss in detail results for week1 to 4. Give the allowable or optimal value. Line 189-192: Discuss in detail results for week1 to 4.	We have modified abstract. We have modified the text. The two temperatures were used since the home refrigerator temperatures are located in this range (4-10°C) We have modified the text.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Give the allowable or optimal value. Table 1: If scaling was used for the last four parameters then the SD determination has no significance. There is no need for SD Table since the same is given in the discussion of each parameter. Figure 5: Move it to come immediately after Section 3.5 Figure 6: Move it to come immediately after Section 3.6. Line 245-247: What is given is just recommendation but there is no conclusion. State also the economic implication of recommending the lowest temperature or cooling for only two weeks especially if the cost of electricity is high. Line 252-279: Only two relevant references are given. It is important to get at least 8 out of 10 on post harvest of the vegetable(s)	Figures were moved below each related section. We have added in results and discussion section that there an economical influence for storage at 4 degree ('Despite that the MAP liners is a bit expensive than PE liners, storage at a lower temperature (i.e. 4°C) for only two weeks has an economic implications for compensation of this cost, especially that the cost of electricity is rather high'.) We have added more references to the text.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	Line 43: Use US\$. Line 47: Delete “will be” and replace with “is” Line 48: Delete “will” and add “s” to “increase”. Delete “think about” and replace “possibilities” with “need”. Line 49: Replace “product” with “leaves”. Line 111: Avoid use of the word “It can be seen”. Figure 1-6: Differentiate the legends to ensure clarity when paper is printed in black and white. Centre the Figure titles.	Done Done Done Done This word “It can be seen” was avoided as much as possible. Done
Optional/General comments		

It is not clear how the results from reference 2 differ from those given in the paper.

In reference nr. 2: Tulio AZ, Ose K, Chachin K, Ueda, Y. Effects of storage temperatures on the postharvest quality of jute leaves (*Corchorus olitorius* L.). Postharvest Biology and Technology. 2002; 26: 329–338.

They has used polyethylene bags only, and the shelf life was 8 days on 8 °C.