



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_34808
Title of the Manuscript:	Blanching time, effect on total phenolic, antioxidant activities and mineral content of selected Green Leafy Vegetables
Type of the 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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The first quotation is that blanching is a short time heating mainly intended to inactivate enzymes trying to keep – as possible – textural characteristics and nutrients content. The center of the material must reach 60 – 70°C. In leafy vegetables it should not be longer than about 1 minute. 5, 10 or 15 minutes in hot water is cooking (that may be a later stage in food preparation but is not the objective of this research paper). The results are formally correct and show – as known for other most common leafy vegetables – that extended cooking time increases nutrients loss. If the interest is to study the effect of “true” blanching, heating times of 1, 2 and – perhaps – 3 minutes should be tested (mainly to “follow” the increase and later decrease in antioxidants content).	We agreed with the reviewer based on the observation of on blanching time, but we based our research on most common method among the people that normally blanched their vegetables more than expected and still call it blanching. We agreed with the reviewer, but the scope of the research was to vary the time base on some research articles used. We agreed with the reviewer, but will believe that the using time 1, 2 and 3 will require more money for analyses.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Minor corrections: - Correct first line of Abstract (10 minutes is repeated and lacks 15 minutes). - The abstract should say if blanching was performed in hot water and/or steam. - Sun drying is only for evaporating surface water after cooling? How long was as it could affect	The abstract has been corrected The blanching was performed using hot water (Corrected) The water will be reduced and some water



SDI Review Form 1.6

	water and antioxidant contents? -The values of axes are lacking in figure 1.	soluble antioxidant can also be affected.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		