



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_4439
Title of the Manuscript:	Chemical, sensory and microbiological evaluation of novel product manufactured from water soluble constituents of germinated grains

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
Dear editor I am sure that you have provided another chance to the author based on comments of other reviewers, indicating that the other reviewrs didnt read the manuscript or it is out of their field, and I can see that clearly from the very few and technical revisions made by the author. It is clear for any reader, and according to my comments, that the design of reasearch in the manuscript is full with many irreversible scientific problems as well as technical and writing problems which make it not acceptable by any way, and the responses of the author already confirmed my last comments on the manuscript. - The most strange in the responses of the author is that he/she didn't modify the methods¹ and still claims that it is a honesty to write the methods as they are in literature, so how quoting methods including conditions and procedures are not applied in the manuscript² to be a honesty, is it a honesty or something else???? The response of the author confirming that the author doesn't understand what he has done and how to be done and it is impossible that the research was done using these methods included in the manuscript³. The response and the problems in the manuscript also confirming that the author has no background about desinging of research, analytical techniques, calculating and analysis of the obtained data or writing of scientific paper. This also because the research was done by a single author and seems like it is the first time to publish internationally in peerreviewed journal and has no former experiance⁴. - Another problem confirm my comments is that the author modified some data in tables⁵ in the revised version without providing why it was changed, what does this mean??? - The most important after all what I have mentioned is that the obtained products has no value⁶ because the aim of the manuscript was to produce products with more health beneficial compared to the original materials, but in fact the methods used for preparation of the products from the beginning until the end is scientifically wrong, which resulted in products with potential health harmful because of decomposition and degradation products produced during the heating process under uncontrolled conditions for long-time⁷. - Therefore, and from the scientific and ethical point, I cannot accept this manuscript for publication⁸.	1) If I modified the method, I can't ascribe it to its reference. 2) All methods mentioned in material and method partition were applied in the manuscript. 3) These are just expectations, however only the author has the fact that this research was done using methods included in the manuscript and she emphasizes that. 4) It is mandatory to present at least one single paper to the promotion committee, so I am going to finish at least two single papers for promotion. This is my second time to publish internationally in peer reviewed journal (my first time was in international journal of dairy science), I was the corresponding author and the paper won as the best scientific paper (Unilever award). 5) Some data was repeated inadvertently, it is reviewed and corrected. 6) The product recorded high values of total phenolics content, antioxidant activity, DPPH scavenging activity and sensory aspects comparing to the original grains which can't be eaten on its state. 7) Germination conditions were controlled according to the mentioned reference. Cooking conditions was controlled by keeping boiling point in water medium for definite period. All analytical methods were carried out according to references mentioned in the manuscript. 8) Thanking you for your helpful comments