



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. The different treatment groups may be better/easily understood by the reader if the authors present the same in a tabular form and denote each group with the legend used in the figure. 2. The parameters, except for chlorophyll levels, evaluated in the study are qualitative in nature with scores attached for evaluation. It would be better if the authors provide a photograph for each of the scoring levels used. 3. The standard deviation values should be present in all the figures. Currently, only figure 1 carries them. 4. The authors need to cite a reference and briefly mention the method they used to determine chlorophyll in the leaves. 5. The authors mention the presence of vitamins, proteins and other micronutrients in the leaves. If the study is supported by the analysis of some of these nutrients over time in different storage conditions, it would greatly bolster the merit of the article. Estimation of chlorophyll gives only an overall view of the well being of the leaf product but nothing specific on its nutritional/ food value.	1. We think that the legend of the figures explained the groups and different treatments. 2. Unfortunate we don't have photographs for each parameter, but this point will be taken into consideration in the further studies. 3. Standard deviations are presented now in all figures. 4. For chlorophyll measurement, a reference was added to the article. 5. We have done this study in this stage, and further study is needed in the future. We have documented that we need further study ('Further investigations are needed to study different storage conditions (e.g. temperatures and liners), and their effects on Jew's mallow postharvest quality.')
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. The authors are requested to proof read the manuscript thoroughly for typographical errors present in the text as well as in the figures. Some of them are in line no.(s) 46, 48, 74 and 100. 2. In Figure 1 the x axis label needs to be corrected. 3. In Figures 2 and 6 there are typographical errors in the	1. We improved the text. 2. We improved the figures. 3. We improved the figures.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	y axis labels. It would be better if the authors maintain uniformity in the figures presented in the manuscript.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The authors focus on an issue pertinent to the region which involves the storage conditions of a major food crop. The investigation presents some important observations which can be used by the industry to protect their product from spoilage. But the article lacks in some aspects, which if addressed to, may make the current study suitable for publication.	We have done this study in this stage, and further study is needed in the future. We have documented that we need further study ('Further investigations are needed to study different storage conditions (e.g. temperatures and liners), and their effects on Jew's mallow postharvest quality.')