

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Food Science Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_80394
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of addition of TiO2 edible coatings and storage on the chicken eggs quality
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.journalafsj.com/index.php/AFSJ/editorial-policy>

**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)																																																		
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p><b>M&amp;M – how many eggs were subjected to the experiment?</b>  <b>Table 1 - If eggs were not coated twice (groups E_D14) they are the same groups as E_D7 and the schema of experiment may be limited. Also it is not necessary to underline each time that the coating was edible. Probably it was and TiO<sub>2</sub> is quite popular but in some countries its use is banned (France, 2020) due to its possible carcinogenic properties.</b>  <b>In case of Haugh units the original source should be cited, Oke et al (2013) are not authors of the formula</b>  <b>Figure 1 is redundant</b>  <b>2.2.1.5 - pH meter technical data (type, producer etc.) should be added, quotation in this line is redundant</b>  <b>How the microbial samples were collected? By swabbing method? Or eggs were washed in buffer? what dilutions were made? What transformation was used for bacteria counting? Log?</b>  <b>Figure 2 also may be omitted, especially that there is any specific description in the text</b>  <b>Were eggs analysed also on the “0” day? There is no reference value</b>  <b>The construction of table should be changed, the comparisons between terms and groups would be easier, probably like this:</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="914 871 2056 1165"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">trait</th> <th rowspan="2">time(days)</th> <th colspan="5">group</th> </tr> <tr> <th>E0</th> <th>E1</th> <th>E2</th> <th>E3</th> <th>E4</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="3">Yolk Index</td> <td>0</td> <td>???</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>0,3206±0,0155<sup>b</sup></td> <td>0,3888±0,0246<sup>de</sup></td> <td>0,3946±0,0210<sup>e</sup></td> <td>0,4032±0,0087<sup>e</sup></td> <td>0,3891±0,0160<sup>de</sup></td> </tr> <tr> <td>14</td> <td>0,2523±0,0082<sup>a</sup></td> <td>0,3853±0,0226<sup>de</sup></td> <td>0,3510±0,0144<sup>bc</sup></td> <td>0,3598±0,0208<sup>cd</sup></td> <td>0,4008±0,0348<sup>e</sup></td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="3">Albumen Index</td> <td>0</td> <td>???</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>0,0520±0,0047<sup>b</sup></td> <td>0,0754±0,0134<sup>cd</sup></td> <td>0,0803±0,0141<sup>d</sup></td> <td>0,0710±0,0055<sup>cd</sup></td> <td>0,0693±0,0055<sup>cd</sup></td> </tr> <tr> <td>14</td> <td>0,0327±0,0070<sup>a</sup></td> <td>0,0644±0,0078<sup>bc</sup></td> <td>0,0632±0,0136<sup>bc</sup></td> <td>0,0825±0,0086<sup>d</sup></td> <td>0,0614±0,0112<sup>bc</sup></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>If 2 levels of probability was analysed (table 1, legend) they should be marked by different letters, typically small letters are used for p&lt;0.05, and capital letters for p&lt;0.01. In M&amp;M only one level (p&lt;0.05) is declared and should be used for all traits.</b>  <b>The numbers after decimal point must be unified (table 3)</b>  <b>The trend showed on the figure 3 is impossible, even, what is obvious, not the same eggs were analysed each time. The HU couldn't increase by 25 units after 14 days. That is why also the initial value (registered at the day “zero”) should be presented.</b>  <b>3.1.5. TPC - all abbreviations should be explained when they first time appear. In this paragraph is information that 10 eggs were analysed, it should be placed in M&amp;M</b>  <b>Conclusions – it is rather obvious that shorter storage time allows to obtain or still keep the good quality of eggs. What about acts of law? Is there any précised term or time duration of eggs storage?</b></p>	trait	time(days)	group					E0	E1	E2	E3	E4	Yolk Index	0	???					7	0,3206±0,0155 <sup>b</sup>	0,3888±0,0246 <sup>de</sup>	0,3946±0,0210 <sup>e</sup>	0,4032±0,0087 <sup>e</sup>	0,3891±0,0160 <sup>de</sup>	14	0,2523±0,0082 <sup>a</sup>	0,3853±0,0226 <sup>de</sup>	0,3510±0,0144 <sup>bc</sup>	0,3598±0,0208 <sup>cd</sup>	0,4008±0,0348 <sup>e</sup>	Albumen Index	0	???					7	0,0520±0,0047 <sup>b</sup>	0,0754±0,0134 <sup>cd</sup>	0,0803±0,0141 <sup>d</sup>	0,0710±0,0055 <sup>cd</sup>	0,0693±0,0055 <sup>cd</sup>	14	0,0327±0,0070 <sup>a</sup>	0,0644±0,0078 <sup>bc</sup>	0,0632±0,0136 <sup>bc</sup>	0,0825±0,0086 <sup>d</sup>	0,0614±0,0112 <sup>bc</sup>	
trait	time(days)			group																																																
		E0	E1	E2	E3	E4																																														
Yolk Index	0	???																																																		
	7	0,3206±0,0155 <sup>b</sup>	0,3888±0,0246 <sup>de</sup>	0,3946±0,0210 <sup>e</sup>	0,4032±0,0087 <sup>e</sup>	0,3891±0,0160 <sup>de</sup>																																														
	14	0,2523±0,0082 <sup>a</sup>	0,3853±0,0226 <sup>de</sup>	0,3510±0,0144 <sup>bc</sup>	0,3598±0,0208 <sup>cd</sup>	0,4008±0,0348 <sup>e</sup>																																														
Albumen Index	0	???																																																		
	7	0,0520±0,0047 <sup>b</sup>	0,0754±0,0134 <sup>cd</sup>	0,0803±0,0141 <sup>d</sup>	0,0710±0,0055 <sup>cd</sup>	0,0693±0,0055 <sup>cd</sup>																																														
	14	0,0327±0,0070 <sup>a</sup>	0,0644±0,0078 <sup>bc</sup>	0,0632±0,0136 <sup>bc</sup>	0,0825±0,0086 <sup>d</sup>	0,0614±0,0112 <sup>bc</sup>																																														
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p><b>Some spelling but also grammar mistakes were found (i.e. “The eggs used as samples were taken from the age of the layer and the harvest on the same day”), the correction of native speaker is recommended.</b></p>																																																			
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>																																																				

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<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>Justyna Batkowska</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Life Sciences in Lublin, Poland</b>