



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_33111
Title of the Manuscript:	Implication of nanocomposite edible coating for self life extention of Indian olive (<i>Elaeocarpus floribundus</i> Blume)
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	Plagiarism check_ The cited article can be found at http://www.cropandweed.com/archives/2015/vol11issue1/19.pdf - First of all, although I have revised all the manuscript and have suggested several minor corrections, I would like to make it clear that this manuscript should be rejected due to the plagiarism throughout the results and discussion. The whole discussion was clearly copied from other research article (Journal Crop and Weed, 11(1):101-107(2015). Thus, I recommend the rejection of this manuscript, unless the authors use their results to produce a new and unpublished article, based on their own discussion and conclusions. - I recommend that the English of this paper is reviewed for grammatical and/or awkward use of the language. - The word SHELF was misspelled in the title and throughout the abstract. SELF should be modified for SHELF. - In general, the abstract should be improved. - Abbreviations on Lines 16 and 17 must be previously defined (on Lines 13 and 14). - Line 15: Unclear what "best results" means - Line 59: which "necessary treatments" are you referring to? - Line 61: consider to improve the description of each step in section 2.2. It is not clear exactly how the edible coating was performed. - Line 66: abbreviation of grams is g, not gm - Line 70: Fruits physico-chemical properties were monitored during 12 days in 3 days intervals. It is not clear in the text. Consider to change the sentence. - Lines 80-85: This sentence is very long. To improve readability, consider breaking this into multiple sentences. - Line 95: the method section states a different name for this measurement. I suggest standardize the nomenclature to facilitate understanding	-Grammatical or language problems were checked. -The spelling of the word 'self' is corrected as 'shelf'. -Abstract is overall improved. -Abbreviations on Lines 16 and 17 are defined on Lines 13 and 14. -Best results means it (T₃) gave the highest results in all parameters during ambient storage where also the loss in weight and decay emergence was start at later stage as compared to control sample. -necessary treatments means sorting of deformed and defected fruits. -The edible coating is prepared followed by the methodology of Wijewardane et al., [9]. - Abbreviation of grams is corrected as 'g'. - Duration of storage with intervals is given in observation sections. -Long sentence is splits in to to multiple sentences. - Nomenclature is improved and same is written in observation and results section. - sentence is corrected as 'it (PLW %)...' instead of 'the it(PLW %)...'. -sentence is modified in Loss in weight section. -Abbreviation of DAS is given in the foot note of the table. -Treatment details are given as footnotes.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	- Line 99: please correct the sentence “the it (PLW %)...” - Lines 99-100: the results described in these lines for 12 days paralleled the results observed for 3 days (lines 97-99), but the sentence started with however. Consider changing the sentence, since the tendency for 3 or 12 days was the same. - Table 1: the word DAYS was misspelled. DAS should be modified for DAYS. - All Tables: Consider include footnotes with the treatments conditions (% of guar gum). - Table 1 and Table 2: the unit of physiological loss in weight should be defined in the Table (PLW %); unclear for me what the values in parentheses mean. All values should be defined in footnotes. - Line 109: Section 3.2 Decay percentage – consider to improve the explanation concerning the protection of coatings as well as the description of results. - Line 131: incorrect verb tense – become should be became - Line 132: 9th day of storage or 9 days of storage. - Lines 133-134: of course, this manuscript is not about corn starch coating nor mature lemons fruits. It is quite clear that this sentence was simply copied from other article (Journal Crop and Weed, 11(1):101-107(2015), as well as other parts throughout the text. - Lines 135-137 and 96-100; 102-106; 113-115; 123-126; 133-137; 149-155; 162-165; 195-199: plagiarism from Journal Crop and Weed, 11(1):101-107(2015). - Line 151: wrong outcome discussion – the edible coating resulted in higher TTS and not lower, as described. - Line 204: This manuscript does not describe physicochemical parameters of ber fruits (such this article: International Journal of Agriculture, Environment and Biotechnology, 8 (3), 601-608, 2015 . DOI : 10.5958/2230-732X.2015.00066.2). Once again, a clearly copied sentence, without changing the sample name. - Line 204: “Among all the coating materials” – In this manuscript only one type of coating material (guar gum) was studied, in different concentrations. Over again, a clearly copied sentence.	-the unit of loss in weight is given in the title of the table. - parentheses means transformed value. -Explanation is improved in decay percentage. -Verb is corrected as 'became'. -9th day of storage is written. -
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- I recommend that the abstract be changed to the form of plain text, without sub items. It may make easier to understand the study development as well as the highlights of authors findings. - Line 11 repeats the information of Line 7 - Line 7: unnecessary - Lines 8-9: unnecessary in the abstract. Other information more relevant are missing in the abstract. - Line 23: try to choose different words from the title - Introduction: Breaking the text into multiple paragraphs should facilitate the comprehension of different topics - Line 41-45: This sentence is very long. To improve readability, consider breaking this into multiple sentences. Consider changing the writing to differentiate from the reference. - Line 50: unnecessary both words few and little. - Line 59: delete the comma between subject and verb - Line 66: abbreviation of millilitre: mL, not ml - Line 67: add a space between heated and in - Section 2.3 – consider breaking into different sub items or at least first specify each parameter and after that describe each one. - Lines 76-77: “with the help of” – unnecessary, informal. Consider to change the sentence. - Line 77-80: improve the description of Total soluble solids method. - Line 86: unnecessary comma - Line 97: if you have defined an abbreviation, use it in the following text - Line 101: consider including probability level ($p<0.05$). - Lines 104-105: unnecessary sentence. The same information was given above. - Lines 105-106: Try to link this information from literature with your results. - Table 1: Change DAS for DAYS. - All Tables: consider correcting typography. Besides, the layout of Tables should be standardized.	-Abstract is modified according to suggestion. - Repetition of information is avoided. - Key words are modified. -Long Sentence is splitted to improve readability. -Instead of both few and little, few is deleted. -Comma (,) is omitted between subject and verb. -Abbreviation of millilitre is corrected. -Space is given between heated and in. -Sub-headings are written under observation recorded section. -Sentence is changed under total soluble solids section. -Comma is omitted after Mazumdar and Majumder. -Abbreviation is used in loss in weight section. -Probability level ($p<0.05$) is included. -Full form of DAS is given. -Layout of tables are standardized.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The plagiarism of the article prevents it from being accepted in any circumstance. The results presented are interest and cover an important topic of research.	