

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>European Journal of Nutrition &amp; Food Safety</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_EJNFS_122664</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Antinutrients in mungbean and strategy for reduction: An overview</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

## Review Form 3

### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (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 is crucial to the scientific community because it reviewed the anti-nutrients in mungbean and its reduction strategy. Anti-nutrients in food should be reduced to tolerable limits because they interfere with the absorption of nutrients in the body.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable since it is clearly stated on the topic that its an overview.	
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.	I would suggest that the abstract should include the specific processing techniques and the effects of each technique on the various antinutrient in mungbean.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, however there should be literature review after the introduction then the conclusion comes after the literature review.	
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.	The manuscript can be considered scientifically robust and technically sound for the following reason. i. The mungbean is well presented and introduced ii. It gives a detailed explanation of antinutrients iii. Also, all the antinutrients in mungbean are profiled and the reduction strategies are explicit iv.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient, although there are some archaic references that needs to be updated.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The article is well-versed and educative.	

### PART 2:

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>	

**Review Form 3**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Daramola Aderayo Sakirat</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Federal Polytechnic Offa, Nigeria</b>