



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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 (Elaeocarpus floribundus Blume)
Type of Article:	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
In the first revision, I strongly recommended the rejection of this manuscript, unless the authors used their results to produce a new and unpublished article, based on their own discussion and conclusions. From the authors response, it can be observed that all of the suggestions were considered, except the most important one: the structure of results and discussion was kept as the initial, no substantial change was done. I would like to reemphasize that the whole discussion was clearly copied from other research article (Journal Crop and Weed, 11(1):101-107(2015). The article remains with plagiarism detected, therefore, I have no other option but strongly reject again the work publishing. These parts of my first revision were not even answered at the feedback file (author's comments): - 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 Thus, I recommend the rejection of this manuscript, unless the authors use their results to produce a new and unpublished article, based on their own discussion and conclusions.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 have already done the necessary corrections according to your recommendation at my best level. I have also revised the conclusion section totally. In the discussion section, I have cited some references for supporting my results which you consider as a plagiarism. I am not copied the data or results from those cited papers; I just used them as a support to my result for better explanation. Besides this, this coating experiment on this particular crop (INDIAN OLIVE) is a totally new approach and there is a very few or no report regarding this topic.



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

- 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.