



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

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

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
Most of my original concerns about the methodology were addressed by the authors and are now clearer. The same for the description of the material used for the packaging. Discussion was improved and more emphasis was given in the impact of temperature in the quality evolution. Although I still think that a measurement of O₂ and CO₂ it is necessary, as a preliminary work it could be accepted. However, the main reason for the rejection of the manuscript is still present: statistical analysis of the data appears to be incorrect or it is unclear. Maybe it is my overzealous approach to statistics due to my agricultural background but I don't completely follow their interpretation. Are they only interested in the indices at the end of storage? In that case, time is not a factor and therefore, a simple Tukey test among values at W4 would be sufficient to point out significant differences. If they are interested in the changes throughout storage, then time is also a factor and a two way ANOVA is necessary to assess the interaction of time in the different types of packaging (considering 4 different treatments and no two other factors: liner and temperature which would made the analysis much more complex). Moreover, why made statistical analysis if they are going to choose what they want in order to justified the use of MAP due to the cost of the electricity? This sentence alone indicates that temperature is the main factor implicated in quality retention: "While the lowest percentage weight loss was in the case of using polyethylene (PE) liners at 4oC ". I still disagree with the conclusion reach by the authors.	Thanks for your comments. Yes we have followed the comments as much as possible, and a clear improvement of the text was obvious. About measuring O₂ and CO₂: measuring O₂ and CO₂ was not the goal of the experiment. We have documented the source (i.e. company) of the MAP liners in our article (Zoepac postharvest solution Ltd., Israel). However, we will take this point (measuring O₂ and CO₂) in the future, but it looks difficult to have them in this stage. Statistical analysis were actually two way ANOVA. We considered both time (weeks) and bag type at 4°C and 10°C (e.g. Bag MAP T10 and Bag MAP T4) as independent variables About electricity: in fact, one of the reviewers suggested to add this note (and we agreed), since he/she thinks that it shows that even we use 4°C (lower than 10°C), but we use it just for two weeks (i.e. shelf life). I think it was not justification for using MAP, but just to explain that shelf life for two weeks at 4°C is not bag for the farmers' economy. About your comment: This sentence alone indicates that temperature is the main factor implicated in quality retention: "While the lowest percentage weight loss was in the case of using polyethylene (PE) liners at 4°C ": We measured the quality indices, by changing temperature and liners, so we explained the data that we got (i.e. what happened if we use different liners at different temperature), but we did not mean that the most important factor was the temperature (both temperature and liners were important).