



SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
<p>1. what problem the authors are trying to solve through this work is not clear. this requires an explanation</p> <p>2. The work on moisture, fats, protein and carbohydrates has been done by others, what value does it add to repeat them in this work? it does not in my opinion. the work on mechanical properties has been done also by others, why is this work different? this requires to be clearly mentioned and the knowledge the work is generating or adding to literature on chicken meat cooking.</p> <p>3. The conclusion on each of moisture, fats, etc. is the same (interaction of variables, ----- this is monotonous and does not add anything to the conclusions).</p> <p>4. The main conclusion is a repetition of what has been said in the body of the report, what is new? what has been solved by this work? As it is, the authors are required to rework the text.</p>	<p>1. This work was aimed to find the best treatment of cooking chicken breast meat in order to have the best taste and quality. This will also serve as guide to meat processors in their decision –making on best conditions of heat application on breast meat and economic implications of heat treatments on chicken breast meat.</p> <p>2. This research is unique and the samples were produced in different dimensions of 3.0 cm x 3.0 cm x 2.0 cm. This has not been done by other researchers. The samples were also treated <i>with</i> four different cooking methods (AF, BK, DF and GR), three cooking temperatures (170, 180 and 190 °C) and five cooking times (0, 4, 8, 12 and 16 min) as factors. This work study the effects of these treatment on the cohesiveness and chewiness of chicken breast meat and it has not been studied.</p> <p>3. The work was a Factorial experiment in Completely Randomized design with two- way analysis of variance. Hence each measured parameters must be studied with the interaction effects of the factors (Method temperature time).</p> <p>4. The peer reviewers reported on this issue. This made me to revise the article and sent back the reviewers comments and my response back to you. This earlier manuscript was a draft copy sent in an error. This work has shown that dry heat cooking results in moisture losses and uptake of oil especially by DF method. Cooking temperatures and times decreased significantly ($p < 0.05$) moisture and protein contents, but increased significantly ($p < 0.05$) fat, ash, cohesiveness, chewiness and non-significantly ($p > 0.05$) carbohydrates contents.</p>