



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_CJAST_49142</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Aloe vera bio-extract coating exhibiting extended shelf life and better fruit quality attributes in pomegranate</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>1) Title: <i>Aloe vera</i> bio-extract coating exhibiting extended shelf life and better fruit quality attributes in pomegranate, authors should cut off "extended shelf life and". Because there is no any data of shelf life in manuscript.</p> <p>2) Abstract, Conclusion, Line 25: <i>Aloe vera (100%) substantially extended the shelf life</i>, it should cut off <i>extended the shelf life</i>.</p> <p>3) Key words: cut off the word of shelf life</p> <p>4) EXPERIMENTAL DETAILS: Authors should specify the age of fruit in this section.</p> <p>5) Authors should write more details about their coating method in the section of EXPERIMENTAL DETAILS.</p> <p>6) EXPERIMENTAL DETAILS: Authors wrote that the experiment was laid out in completely randomized design (CRD), but their abstract in line 9 wrote that The lab experiment conducted in complete randomized design with factorial. Thus, it is conflicting.</p> <p>7) EXPERIMENTAL DETAILS: Lacking packaging material after coating, thus authors should write more details in this section.</p> <p>8) 3.2 Decay loss (%): Authors should add their discussion why the least decay loss received from 3% ginger.</p> <p>9) 3.6 Anthocyanin content (mg/100 g), Line 170-173: The increment of anthocyanin content was more pronounced in uncoated fruits than the coated fruits it may be attributed to the fact that the modified atmosphere created by bio-extract coating reduce the transpiration loss and thus the less increment in anthocyanin content was observed in uncoated fruits. It's not a straightforward writing. Authors should discuss that how is it related between coating and anthocyanin content?.</p> <p>10) Line 160-161: The variation in anthocyanin content due to interaction between packaging materials and storage conditions was statistically non-significant. In spite of no detail about packaging material in this manuscript.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	1) Line 274: ( <i>Carica Papaya</i> L.).change to ( <i>Carica papaya</i> L.).	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	-	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Liamngee Kator</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Benue State University , Nigeria</b>