## SDI Review Form 1.6

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

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | **fish" i.e absence of significant differences suggest that smoking negated / eliminated the three fish species respective organoleptic properties. Is this correct?**<br>**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..."**<br>**No reference to Table 2 in the text**<br>**Table 2: Why the overall attribute score for the three fish species when the objective was to establish differences among the three fish species.**<br>**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?**<br>**Figure 1: symbols are preferred to colours especially for black and white.**<br>**Line 194: Bacterial Population of Fish Samples and not Quantitative...**<br>**Lines 203-206: The author should have determined some of these parameters such pH and the proximate composition of the samples.**<br>**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)**<br>**Lines 261-277...Discussion should be concise and highly relevant to the present findings.**<br>**Lines 278-289: Discuss with emphasis on the fish types and the observed variations in quality attributes and avoid repetitions.**<br>**Line 296: The present finings 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** | |

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

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

**Reviewer Details:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Name: | **Anonymous** |
| Department, University & Country | **Nigeria** |