

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_123199
Title of the Manuscript:	Kinetics of Chlorophyll Degradation in Malabar Spinach (<i>Basellae alba</i>) and Waterleaf (<i>Talinum triangulare</i>) during Hydrothermal Processing
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript highlights on the importance of of duration and temperature used during blanching. An aspect important during hydrothermal processing of vegetables. The findings are very important in educating the processors on the importance of maintaining the nutritive value of the vegetables during processing. However, the information provided on the importance of chlorophyll in vegetables is scanty and the author can expound more of the benefits and the needs to preserve such contents in vegetable as the background information	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	<p>In the abstract, the Author indicates that the 'Freshly harvested leafy vegetables Malabar spinach (<i>Basella alba</i>) and waterleaf (<i>Talinum triangulare</i>) were obtained and subjected to various hydrothermal conditions (60, 65, 70, 75 and 80°C at 10, 15 and 20 minutes) simulating typical cooking conditions'however, on the results, the Author indicates that 5 minutes resulted into low degradation... the 5 minutes is not indicated in the methodology, hence this contradicts the results.</p> <p>The importance of maintaining chlorophyll is not significantly indicated, while the methodology in the abstract does not show how the chlorophyll was extracted</p>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure is okay	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<p>The methodology sections contains contradictory information- It shows that the vegetables were also blanched up to 90 degrees celcius, yet this is not in the abstract neither in the results .</p> <p>The chlorophyll extraction method is not well expounded and, just adding 80% acetone on non crushed samples might not exhaustively extracts all the chlorophyll.</p> <p>The conclusion should be data based and quote on the results .</p>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient, however, some of them are over 20 years old	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	The Manuscript is Okay, but the Author should take time to improve it. Let the vegetable pictures also be clear	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dinah Kirigia
Department, University & Country	Meru University of Science and Technology, Kenya