



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	The objective of the present work is clear and it seems of importance for areas where Jew's mallow is consumed. However, the execution of the objective is inappropriate and the conclusion reached did not agree with the results. EXPERIMENTAL DISIGN: the authors used two kinds of packaging materials but fail to provide details about them, only its commercial name. Moreover, one of them is aimed to create a modified atmosphere inside the bag but never they measure the changes or made some kind of reference to it in the discussion. This is very important to the repeatability of the work and the interpretation of the results, along with bag size, water and gas permeability. The techniques used to measure weight loss and chlorophyll content are poor described, making impossible to replicate the work. As for the sensorial analysis used to asses the rest of the quality indicators, the authors fail to provide accurate information about how those assays were carried out: trained judges, researchers of the lab, consumers, how many people participate, did they use coded samples, etc. The statistical analysis of the data appears incomplete or plain wrong. They have 3 factors in the analysis: temperature, packaging and time. They should test the interaction and then make the analysis. More coments on Materials and Methods are in the manuscript. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION: some of the results does not make sense, but then again are strongly influenced by the statistical analysis. I can totally understand if the authors	We have modified the text. We have provided that name of the company (Zoepac postharvest solution Ltd., Israel).which produce the liners, and the specifications of the liners are not available for public, but any researcher can get them from the company producing this MAP liners. Wight loss: we have added the method we used for measuring it. Chlorophyll content: we have added a reference, that explain the method for measurement. Who carried out the evolution: we have explained that in this version ('Evaluation was done by experienced staff from extension department at Palestinian Ministry of Agriculture').



SDI Review Form 1.6

	wish to compare the indices at each week between treatments or during storage. A whole comparison like they did is confusing and I don't think it is correct. They should address the interactions before. No discussion or explanation of the results was made. No one single comment on the effect of temperature that seems to be prevalent along the storage, even more than the film. Again, the authors used a packaging that modified atmosphere in the headspace but we don't know the O₂ or CO₂ level. All results and the discussion are strongly related to those parameters and they did not appear. CONCLUSION: I personally do not agree with the conclusion. No significant improvement is obtained by using MAP as opposed to PE. Refrigeration (4°C) seems more relevant to maintained quality than MAP. I am sure that the MAP bags are more expensive than PE bags and therefore ,there is not used for them if the other material serves as well.	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.'). In further study such measurement of O₂ or CO₂ levels will be taken into consideration. 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'.')
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		We have followed many suggestions that the reviewer sent in PDF file of the article.