



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
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 BRASSILENSIS) IN NIGERIA

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
The author effected virtually all the corrections indicated in the original manuscript. However, some mistakes/oversights are also detected in the revised manuscript and they are as follows: 2.1 How many fish samples per fish species 2.6 .1 amended with antifungal mixture, not known method 3.1 are presented in Table 1 (no bracket) Table 1. Underscore "Storage time and Parameters and bottom of Table before footnotes 3.2 The moisture content....in Table 2 (no bracket) In this study, moisture content ranged from 19.0 – 25.8% (no bracket) and delete "in the fish samples studied" Table 2: Remove all horizontal lines except top and bottom 3.3...pH, redox potential (E_h) Table 3 delete all vertical lines and horizontal lines except top and bottom. 3.4 Fig. 1, no Fig is attached- Conclusion: ...less than 6 (i.e fair). Therefore, the fish were marginally acceptable based on sensory and microbiological evaluations.	2.1 five fish samples per fish species, see line 85. 2.6.1 amended with antifungal mixture has been properly illustrated, see line 131 Bracket removed in Table 1, see line 152 Table 1. Underscore "Storage time and Parameters and bottom of Table before footnotes See line 172 Bracket removed in Table 1, see line 178 Bracket removed from 19.0 – 25.8% and "in the fish samples studied" deleted, see line 179 Table 2: All horizontal lines except top and bottom have been removed, see line 189-190 3.3...pH, redox potential (E_h) has been corrected, see line 207 Table 3 all vertical lines and horizontal lines except top and bottom. have been deleted, see line220-221 3.4 Fig. 1 is attached, see line269 Conclusion: ...less than 6 (i.e fair). Therefore, the fish were marginally acceptable based on sensory and microbiological evaluations, see line 275-277