



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_32175
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Natural Antioxidants Extracted from Simarouba glauca and Radermachera xylocarpa Deoiled Seed Cakes on the Oxidative Stability of Soyabean Oil during Accelerated 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/30/editorial-policy>)



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Manuscript Ms_EJNFS_32175, submitted to the <i>European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety</i> reports on the antioxidant properties of two different extraction residues. The authors conclude that these extracts can effectively stabilise soyabean oil. I do not know what is done with the seedcake extraction residues at present but presumably, their value is low. This means that the authors have identified a low value by-product as raw material for a high-value antioxidant. I recommend that this manuscript be published after minor modifications. I have the following comments which concern mainly typing errors: 1. Line 18: Oils and fats do not contain essential amino acids. 2. Line 23: 'ter' should read 'tert' 3. Line 24: 'gallate propyls' should read 'propyl gallates'. 4. Line 27: 'immerse' should read 'immense'. 5. Line 34: 'salvation' should read 'solution'. 6. Line 46: 'growth' should read 'grows'.	This was a mistake. This has been corrected. This has been corrected. This has been corrected. This has been corrected. This has been corrected. This has been corrected.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	7. Line 49: 'tropicalareasin' should read 'tropical areas in'. 8. Lines 83, 85 and 86: 'grounded' should read 'ground'. 9. Line 84. What extraction solvent was used? 10. Lines 85 and 86: Should the phrase 'were grounded to 85 pass through a 1 mm sieve.' Perhaps read 'dried to constant weight.'? 11. Line 107: 'agilent' should read 'Agilent'. 12. Line 121: 'min and the' should read 'min, the' 13. Line 123: Shouldn't the concentration of the BHT solution be mentioned? Or is it each time the same as the concentration of the methanolic extracts? If so, please clarify. 14. Line 126: This formula cannot be correct. If $\text{Abs control} = \text{Abs sample}$, the AA% equals zero and when $\text{Abs sample} = 0$ (no antioxidant activity), the AA would equal 100% 15. Line 130: 'samples' should read 'sample'. 16. Line 137: 'served' delete?	This has been corrected. Methanol. Yes the seeds were dried to constant weight. This has been corrected. This has been corrected. The concentration of BHT solutions in this test were the same as those of the methanolic extract. The absorbance of the control here cannot be equal to zero because the control is the DPPH solution without antioxidants. Its absorbance is always higher at 500 nm compared to the other solutions, where the DPPH is reduced by the antioxidants presents in the extract. This has been corrected. This has been corrected. This has been corrected. That is the potential concentration in the dried sample when the amount of methanol has been reduced. This has been corrected. This has been corrected. This has been corrected.
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	17. Line 138: 10 mL methanol weighs about 8 g or 8000mg. So 1 mL methanol per 100 g oil is the same as 10 mL per kg or 80 000 mg/kg, so it far from similar to the upper limits allowed in Europe and Japan. 18. Line 150: 'tests' should read 'test'. 19. Line 150: 'switch' should read 'switched'. 20. Line 171: It is customary to write the 'p' in <i>p</i>-anisidine in italics. Use the Find/replace subroutine of MSWord since there are several iinstances. 21. Line 172: 'CD' should read 'Cd'. 22. Line 185: Under results, the authors should also report the oil and cake yields of the Soxhlet extraction. 23. Line 190: Seedcake will contain some water that will be extracted by methanol. However, when the methanol is evaporated from the extract, water will also evaporate. So what does this methanolic extract consist of? There is so much of it. 100 g cake yield 8.5-11.5 g extract, at least according to the authors. Can they verify this since they have been a factor of 100 out on a previous occasion. 24. Line 191: 'glauceextract' should read 'glauca	This has been corrected. This has been reported in the revised manuscript. Before operating the soxhlet extraction, the seeds were dried to constant weight, this in order to avoid any effect of water. After evaporating the methanol on rotatory evaporator, the extracts were again dried in the oven at 45 °C for 48 hours to eliminate moisture and the residual methanol. This has been corrected. This has been corrected. This has been corrected. This has been corrected. This has been corrected. This is only to have the global oxidation state of the oil, in term of both primary and secondary oxidation products and not in term of primary products first and secondary products secondly. This has been corrected.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	extract'. 25. Lines 191 and 192: Botanical names should be in italics. 26. Line 230: 'extractson' should read 'extracts on'. 27. Line 238: 'extractwas' should read 'extract was'. 28. Line 277: 'extractsas' should read 'extracts as'. 29. Line 292: Since the manuscript already reports the PV and <i>p</i>-AV, there is really no need not report the TOTX values, especially since the latter does not add anything that is unexpected. 30. Line 316: 'arerespectively' should read 'are'respectively' 31. Line 316: The extracts have a phenolic content of 10-20 mg/gallic acid equivalent per gram of oil. How does this compare with the value for BHT? This is not usually mentioned but easy to measure and to include in the manuscript. 32. Line 317: Insert 'seedcake' before 'extract'. 33. Line 318: Do you mean '250 µg GAE/mg', which would be equal to 250mg GAE/g or rather '250 µg GAE /g'.	It is not per gram of oil but per gram of methanolic extract. For example: 10 mg GAE/g of extract. This has been corrected. I mean 250 µg GAE/ mg which is equal to 250 mg GAE/g. This has been corrected. This has been corrected. This has been corrected. This has been corrected. This has been corrected. This has been corrected. This has been corrected. This has been corrected. This has been corrected. This has been corrected. This has been corrected. This has been done. This has been corrected.
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	34. Line 320: 'climat' should read 'climate'. 35. Line 324: 'presents' should read 'present'. 36. Lines 335 and 337: Replace 'responsible of' by 'responsible for'. 37. Line 341: 'extractson' should read 'extracts on'. 38. Line 343: Delete 'ranged'. 39. Line 344: Replace 'most' by 'more'. 40. Line 351: 'wassignificantly' should read 'was significantly'. 41. Line 376: Replace 'responsible to' by 'responsible for'. 42. Line 381: Replace 'wasranged in' by 'was'. 43. Line 383: 'presents' should read 'present'. 44. Line 384: Insert 'for' after 'responsible'. 45. Line 384: 'products' should read 'product'. 46. Line 385: 'explainits' should read 'explain its'. 47. Line 391: Replace 'demonstrated control to be significantly oxidized' by 'demonstrated the control to be significantly more oxidized'.	This has been corrected.
--	---	---------------------------------



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	See attached MSWord document	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		