



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Line 65...in addition, other workers (Martin 1994;Efiuvwevwere and Ajiboye 1996) have shown that most microorganisms including moulds are associated with smoked fish). Line 69... the particular species of wood used depends on local availability and desirable quality impacted on the fish(consult references) Line 75...therefore <u>was</u> aimed at evaluating the organoleptic and microbial qualities. Line 78...Why use of rubber wood instead of another wood? Line 89...Please state quantity of samples used. Line 103...State interval of periodic bacterial analysis. Line 107... Please state the basis for selecting the ten panelists. Lines 120-124..Flawed methodology: serial dilution should be 1g sample in 9ml, not in 10ml Line 128...amended with an <u>antifungal mixture</u>, this is not conventional/ any reference? Line 133...Which characteristics were used to identify the isolates. Line 142...Organoleptic (sensory) quality changes. Line 143... Please re-structure such as "The results of the organoleptic assessment ...presented in Table 1. Lines 145-153...Please re-structure and cite relevant references. Lines 153-155...stated that differences between fish species may be reflected in the quality of the smoked	Micro-organisms listed was done based on the title of the paper. Reference for amended antifungal mixture was included in corrected manuscript. Characteristics were used to identify the isolates have been added as recommended. Time interval between end of smoking and analysis was immediate after fish samples allowed to cool.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	fish" i.e absence of significant differences suggest that smoking negated / eliminated the three fish species respective organoleptic properties. Is this correct? Lines 156-167...Please re-structure for improved conciseness e.g " the attribute that the panellist gave..."should be " The overall attribute, taste was scored highest..." No reference to Table 2 in the text Table 2: Why the overall attribute score for the three fish species when the objective was to establish differences among the three fish species. Line 183: The increase in moisture content immediately after smoking is difficult to explain and is contrary to earlier findings. What was the time interval between end of smoking and analysis? Figure 1: symbols are preferred to colours especially for black and white. Line 194: Bacterial Population of Fish Samples and not Quantitative... Lines 203-206: The author should have determined some of these parameters such pH and the proximate composition of the samples. Lines 206-211; "The bacterial load of fish rarely indicates quality of the fish but... risk of spoilage..." (this is contradictory and needs to be re-structured) Lines 261-277...Discussion should be concise and highly relevant to the present findings. Lines 278-289: Discuss with emphasis on the fish types and the observed variations in quality attributes and avoid repetitions. Line 296: The present findings do not support the conclusion, e.g Table 1 shows that most samples were unacceptable on the 6th week. Also, no data/ correlation to confirm the conclusion that the lower	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	the population diversity of micro organisms, the longer the shelf-life... Lines 299-301...During shelf storage were from soil, water and air...(no data to supports this). Lines 305-307...Obviously, these "gaps" confirm the preliminary nature of this work.	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Lines 34-37...total bacterial group population is 82.69% what about the remaining 17.31%? Line 43...state common/ local names of the samples. Line 79...would have little or significant...the objectives <u>were</u> to: ...and the microbiological qualities... Line 95: Why were the samples not gutted? Line 115...the moisture content...<u>was determined</u>... Line 127...each of the serially diluted <u>was</u> prepared. Lines 143-155...improve on the editorial/ sentence structures e.g The difference in the quality...<u>are in</u> agreement. Lines 214-215...normal range of 10^2-10^7cfu/g not /ml. Also, more relevant recent references are needed. Lines 220-226...not clear, re-structure and state concisely. Line 231: Bacterial flora of fish samples (not qualitative...) Lines 232-255: This is quantitative which is at variance with the sub- heading (re-structure).	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Referencing style should be consistent eg Harvard Line 48...demand for fish consumption Line 57...attack <u>by</u> microbes Line 100...rubber wood...to simulate 9not to stimulate. Please consult other publications including Efiuvwevwere B.J.O & Ajiboye M.O 1996 Efiuvwevwere B.J.O & Iweanoge H.A 1991	