SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review**
Manuscript Number:	**2014_IJBcRR_14230**
Title of the Manuscript:	**BLANCHING AND JUICING EFFECT ON FLAVONOIDS CONTENTS IN COMMONLY CONSUMED LEAFY VEGETABLES IN SOUTH WEST NIGERIA**
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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

SDI 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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	* The conclusion in the abstract does not match the results presented in the paper, since it says that "flavonoids content in juice extract of Hibiscus esculenta was low…", and the results say that the higher value was found for Hibiscus esculenta. Review this conclusion to match the results and the conclusion of the paper. * lines 24-25: the authors say that "… evidences have shown that adequate consumption of fruit and vegetable rich diets have substantial role in reducing the risk of chronic disease, including cardiovascular disease, ageing…". In the way it is written, the authors say that ageing is a chronic disease. Is ageing considered a chronic disease? * review the second paragraph of the introduction section. Parts of it are difficult to understand, like the supplement part of line 36 and the part that talks about the complications of metabolites in line 38. * provide more details about the methods used, like the concentration of the diluted HCl in line 76. * what was the statistical analysis used? * in the discussion section, the authors should explain better why the bleaching increased/decreased the flavonoid content of the samples tested, since they mostly compare to other papers, but don't explain why it happened. * review the conclusion of the paper, it should be considered the aim of the study and the results obtained to write the conclusion. So I believe the authors should remove the parts where they talk about antioxidant	

	properties, since they did not evaluate antioxidant activity, only the flavonoid content.	
Minor REVISION comments	* Review the English grammar of the article. There are a few problems in the text, for example: - in the methodology section of the abstract ("each vegetable were…" - it should be "each vegetable was…") – other parts of the text have the same problem, like line 78 ("5 mls" – the correct form is "5 ml") ; line 148 ("flavonoids achieves" – the correct form is "flanovoids achieve"); line 155 ("tables 2" – the correct form if "table 2"). - line 20 of the introduction ("… have attracted alteration…" – it should be "have attracted attention…"); - line 159 of the discussion (a space is lacking in "babatataswhich", and there is a "ba" more than necessary – it should be "batatas which" – other parts of the paper have the same problem). * Most of the scientific names of the plants studied are written without a space between the two words of the name, like "Amaranthusviridis" that should be written "Amaranthus viridis". Review all the scientific names in all the paper. * lines 154-155, "… contained highest flavonoids content while lowest…" the part "while lowest" should the deleted, since it is out of place here.	
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Melissa Walter**
Department, University & Country	**Instituto Federal de Educação, Ciência e Tecnologia Farroupilha - Brazil**