



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_4087
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE STUDY ON THE BACTERIA LOAD OF THREE FISH SPECIES SMOKE-DRIED USING RUBBER WOOD (HEVEA BRASSILLENIS) IN NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Research paper

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

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

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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	1. In the introductory section of the manuscript the authors should add a section, in which they will explain why they used the particular species in their investigation. 2. In the material and method section more information is needed. The authors should give more information on the smoking process, sensory and microbiological tests and specify the number of specimens they analyzed per sampling period and fish. The authors should reconsider the way they processed the sensory data. Non parametric tests are used for processing data with discrete values. In addition, acceptability tests, which were used in the study, are performed with 50 untrained assessors. The authors, should define also the rejection point (i.e. less than 3= neither like or dislike) Comments have been introduced in the material and methods section of the attached manuscript. The authors should consider all of them. 3. In the results and discussion section the authors should re- consider the interpretation of their sensory data (lines 156-167; Table 1 and 2) according to the comments, which have been introduced in the attached manuscript. 4. The authors should reconsider the "conclusion section" By the sixth week of storage all tested fish had an overall mean score of acceptability less than 3. Therefore the fish were unacceptable by sensory	Comments made by the reviewer in 1,2,3 and 4 was addressed.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	and microbiological methods.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The study is of restricted commercial interest, since it describes a procedure of smoking and handling of finished product that is not commonly used in other countries. For example, the smoking process includes a brining step, which is important in the quality retention of smoked products. The smoked products are usually stored in chilled conditions (usually at 4°C) vacuum packed. The major drawback s of the manuscript are: (1) the restricted number of the individuals they performed the sensory assessments, (2) the number of replications (n values) per sampling day, fish and method of analysis is not reported.	the procedure of smoking and handling of finished product that is commonly used fisherfolks is commonly used in this parts of the country.