

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_90347
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of chitosan coating on shelf-life, biochemical properties and nutrient elements of carrot (<i>Daucus carota</i>) during postharvest storage
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:

<https://www.journalcjust.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy>)

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	<p>a. One of the reported parameter was shelf life. However the method used for determining the shelf life by the author(s) is not clear. Shelf life usually refers to: "time during which a food maintains characteristics and a level of quality that is suitable for human consumption". Therefore the unit of shelf life is "time" and should be stated in days, months, or years. Please provide a detailed information on how the author determine the shelf life value and how the convert it to percentage.</p> <p>b. Results and Discussion Section: Total phenolic content → All the chitosan treatments significantly ($P \leq 0.05$) reduced the phenolic content of carrots compared with control at 8 DAPS → This sentence state as if the reduced phenolic content were due to chitosan treatment. However this is not the case. The control also shows a reduced total phenolic content. Please revise the sentence. This also applies for the other parameter.</p> <p>c. Table 1: the author did not include the fresh sample for analysis. I think the author should include the fresh sample, so that they can compare the change against the fresh sample, whether it reduced significantly compared to the fresh sample.</p> <p>d. Table 1: Does the author mean with "LSD" line is the p-value obtained from ANOVA with LSD post hoc test? Please state this on the line. How come when the p-value for P and S is lower than 0.05, no significant differences between the means detected, but for phenol, Na and K the p-value were 0.068, 0.082, and 0.182 but significant differences were detected between the means. The author(s) need to recheck the calculation</p> <p>e. The author(s) observed increase in Ca, Na, K, and S when the carrot treated with chitosan. Since the carrot does not grown in the soil anymore and not be able to absorb minerals from the soil, author need to provide more explanation why this can be occurred, not only comparing to other fresh sample. Is it possible the chitosan has Ca, Na, K and S content and therefore can increase the content of these compounds in the treated sample? The author(s) can provide composition of chitosan used in the study.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The author(s) provide a study on application of chitosan for coating carrot to increase shelf life. The manuscript was well written, however there are some revision required to improve the manuscript quality and made the explanations clearer.	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Safri Ishmayana
Department, University & Country	Universitas Padjadjaran, Indonesia