



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_9398
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Storage on the Quality Attributes of Concentrates of Two Mango (<i>Mangifera indica</i>) Varieties Grown in Sudan
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

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



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: 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	MATERIAL AND METHODS : 1- How many fruits were sampled? And how was mangoes evaluated at harvesting levels? Also this work does not include a study of antimicrobial and nor are they even mentioned in the background section, line 110 (0.1 gm cholraphenicol per one litter of medium to inhibit bacteria growth on samples. 2- Line 109 (2.6.1 Yeast and mold enumeration), this section supposed to be talk about yeast and mold , but all information in this section talk about bacteria. So, all information in this section should be moved to line 114 section (Enumeration of total spore forming bacteria). Also author should write methodology of Yeast and mold isolations. 3- Line 158 (Total acidity decreased after two months, then it increased during the remaining period of storage, this could be due to partial hydrolysis of organic acid). Where is the reference? In general, most fruits are high-acid 4- Line 58 CONCLUSION: what is new? (As the concentrates which stored at refrigerator showed an excellent attributes than that which stored at room Temperature). 5- The author in most his manuscript refer to unpublished data, and this is a mistake and unreliable	1. Twenty five samples from each variety were used. Only fully ripe and sound fruits sample were selected. Information about antimicrobial were now included in the background. 2. All information in the section (Yeast and mold enumeration) were moved to the section (Enumeration of total spore forming bacteria). A method for yeast and mold isolations was included. 3. The reference was included. 4. The objective of this project is to produce concentrates at remote areas of production, therefore we have conclude with the importance of storage at refrigerator. 5. All unpublished data were replaced with



SDI Review Form 1.6

	source, an example : seven times mentioned unpublished results in the lines : 36, 159, 172, 179, 183, 7 and 37 ,	published ones.
Minor REVISION comments	1- The author mentioned in the lines 93 and 182 (non-enzymatic browning), but in the table 2, mentioned (enzymatic browning) without none. What is the correct? 2- 9 references out of 17 are old, need to be up dated (2, 4, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17).	1. Non – Enzymatic browning and it was amended in the MS. 2. Most of the old references were updated
Optional/General comments	1- This manuscript presents preliminary findings, which lacks a scientific approach to handle or explore any problem or challenge. 2 - Yeasts and moulds are commonly grown on fruits, the question is, , how the author did not find even moulds growing during the six months of storage at room temperature. If any ethical issue, please clarify	1. This preliminary finding is very important because there is no much publications on Sudanese mango. 2. That is may be due to the heat treatment and subsequently, the possible reduction in water activity