



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_38796
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of Drying Methods on the Chemical Properties of Okra (Abelmoschus esculentus L. Moench) Slices
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	The paper entitled “Effects of Drying Methods on the Chemical Properties of Okra (<i>Abelmoschus esculentus</i> L. Moench) Slices” propose aim is to to investigate into the effects of open sun drying, solar drying and oven drying on the chemical composition and wholesomeness of the Okra. It is a very interesting paper, well prepared, covering a lot of relevant information. The methodology and data analysis are good, the writing style and the clarity of the exposition are fine, conclusions are clear. I propose to shorten introduction. I have no specific scientific concern but it is mandatory to correct the manuscript in some points: # Abstract: Is „Okra (<i>Abelmoschus esculentus</i>) samples were subjected to three different drying methods using solar, sun and oven. Chemical and sensory properties of the dried okra samples were investigated using fresh okra as control. Natural open sun drying took about 19 1/2 hours to dry the okra to constant moisture content of 12.67% (w/b), solar dryer took 12 hours to dry to 12.50% (w/b) and hot air oven took about 10 1/2 hour to dry to 5.50% (w/b). The results of chemical properties showed that the fresh okra contained 75.67% moisture, 11.99% crude protein, 0.34% crude fat, 1.03% crude ash, 0.50% crude fiber, 10.47% carbohydrate, 92.90 Kcal energy value, 12.83 cP viscosity and 26.04 mg/100g vitamin C. The open sun dried okra contained 21.93% crude protein, 2.56% crude fat, 9.33% crude ash, 8.05% crude fiber, 45.46% carbohydrate, 292.60 Kcal energy value, 13.10 cP viscosity and 17.14 mg/100g vitamin C. Solar dried okra contained 29.40% crude protein, 4.91% crude fat, 10.12% crude ash, 8.71% crude fiber 34.36% carbohydrate, 299.23 Kcal energy value, 15.47 cP viscosity and 19.21 mg/100g vitamin C. Oven dried okra contained 17.97% crude protein, 2.20% crude fat, 9.23% crude ash, 6.12% crude fiber, 58.98% carbohydrate, 333.60 Kcal energy value, 21.13 cP viscosity and 14.08 mg/100g vitamin C. The above results showed that the drying methods used have a significant effect ($p<0.05$) on the physicochemical properties of the dried okra. The nutritional and sensory quality of the solar dried okra is superior to open sun and oven dried okra. It was concluded that better quality shelf stable dried okra can be obtained from solar drying method.” Should be „Okra (<i>Abelmoschus esculentus</i>) samples were subjected to three different drying methods using solar, sun and oven. Chemical and sensory properties of the dried okra samples were investigated using fresh okra as control. Natural open sun drying took about 19.5 hours to dry the okra to constant moisture content of 12.67 % (w/b), solar dryer took 12 hours to dry to 12.50 % (w/b) and hot air oven took about 10.5 hour to dry to 5.50 % (w/b). The results of chemical properties showed that the fresh okra contained 75.67 % moisture, 11.99 % crude protein, 0.34 % crude fat, 1.03 % crude ash, 0.50 % crude fiber, 10.47 %	Corrected as suggested.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	carbohydrate, 92.90 Kcal energy value, 12.83 cP viscosity and 26.04 mg/100 g vitamin C. The open sun dried okra contained 21.93 % crude protein, 2.56 % crude fat, 9.33 % crude ash, 8.05 % crude fiber, 45.46 % carbohydrate, 292.60 Kcal energy value, 13.10 cP viscosity and 17.14 mg/100 g vitamin C. Solar dried okra contained 29.40 % crude protein, 4.91 % crude fat, 10.12 % crude ash, 8.71 % crude fiber 34.36 % carbohydrate, 299.23 Kcal energy value, 15.47 cP viscosity and 19.21 mg/100 g vitamin C. Oven dried okra contained 17.97 % crude protein, 2.20 % crude fat, 9.23 % crude ash, 6.12 % crude fiber, 58.98 % carbohydrate, 333.60 Kcal energy value, 21.13 cP viscosity and 14.08 mg/100 g vitamin C. The above results showed that the drying methods used have a significant effect ($p<0.05$) on the physicochemical properties of the dried okra. The nutritional and sensory quality of the solar dried okra is superior to open sun and oven dried okra. It was concluded that better quality shelf stable dried okra can be obtained from solar drying method.” # line 85: Is: “The drying experiment was conducted in March to April 2016 when the ambient temperature was approximately 27°C at 7.00am.” Should be: “The drying experiment was conducted in March to April 2016 when the ambient temperature was approximately 27°C at 7.00 am.” # line 98: Is: “Samples of fresh and dried Okra were analyzed for the following parameters, moisture, protein, fat, ash, fibre, carbohydrate, energy value (Kcal), Viscosity (cP) and Vitamin C (mg/100g).” Should be: “Samples of fresh and dried Okra were analyzed for the following parameters, moisture, protein, fat, ash, fibre, carbohydrate, energy value (Kcal), Viscosity (cP) and Vitamin C (mg/100 g).” # line 219: Is: “The vitamin C content of the FRO was 26.04 mg/100g, which was significantly ($p<0.05$) different from the dried samples. The OSD Okra was 14.08 mg/100g, SLD was 19.21 mg/100g and OVD was 17.14 mg/100g.” Should be: “The vitamin C content of the FRO was 26.04 mg/100 g, which was significantly ($p<0.05$) different from the dried samples. The OSD Okra was 14.08 mg/100 g, SLD was 19.21 mg/100 g and OVD was 17.14 mg/100 g.” # line 205: Is “The carbohydrate contents of the dried okra ranged from 45.46 % to 58.98 %.” Should be “The carbohydrate contents of the dried okra ranged from 45.46 to 58.98 %.” # line 382; Table 1: Is “Table 1: Chemical Properties of Fresh and Dried Okra” Should be “Table 1. Chemical Properties of Fresh and Dried Okra” Also is „Vitamin C (mg/100g)”, should be „Vitamin C (mg/100 g)”	Corrected as suggested. Corrected as suggested. Corrected as suggested. Corrected as suggested.
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	# line 410 Figure 1: Is “Figure 1: The comparison of okra’s drying curves in the 410 oven, solar and open sun drying methods” Should be “Figure 1. The comparison of okra’s drying curves in the 410 oven, solar and open sun drying methods” # line 415 Figure 2: Is “Figure 2: Sensory Evaluation of Dried Okra.” Should be “Figure 2. Sensory Evaluation of Dried Okra”	Corrected as suggested. Corrected as suggested.
Minor REVISION comments	#line 134: Is: “....took about 191/2 hours to.....” I suggestion change the hours for example 19.5 hours. # line 204: Is “The carbohydrate contents of the FRO was 11.15%. The carbohydrate contents of the dried okra ranged from 45.46 % to 58.98 %.” You should be consequent because you wrote 11.15% without spaces and then you wrote 45.46 % with spaces. You should correct these in whole manuscript.	Corrected as suggested. Corrected as suggested. Corrected as suggested.
Optional/General comments	# I suggest read instruction of author and check and correct whole manuscript especially references.	Corrected as suggested.