

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_94026
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF THERMAL TREATMENTS ON SELECTED MINERALS AND WATER SOLUBLE VITAMINS OF CHICKEN BREAST MEAT
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.journalejns.com/index.php/EJNFS/editorial-policy>)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. It is not detailed (no literature is provided?) in the introduction section of the article that the micronutrients measured in the test are representative of those in chicken meat.2. Why did author use the three cooking temperature regimes? Is there any relevant literature or pre-test data to support?3. Is there a fundamental difference between BK and GR?4. The author indicates that higher Mg content of DF compared to others could be attributed to absorption of soluble and impurity from the frying oil, but no explanation for the increase in Mg contents in the other three treatments.4. The information in some references is incomplete, please check and complete them.	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Can author provide the specific variety and feeding time of chicken used in this research?2. Does cooking with different volumes of canola oil in the DF section affect the assay results? And even different kinds of oils?3. The font is not uniform within the article.	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Can the reliability of the test data be guaranteed by repeating each test only 2 times?	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pufu Lai
Department, University & Country	Institute of Agricultural Engineering Technology, Fujian Academy of Agricultural Sciences, National R&D Center for Edible Fungi Processing, China