



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_48894
Title of the Manuscript:	Response of Bioactive Phytochemicals in Vegetables and Fruits to Environmental Factors
Type of the Article	Review 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 (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	<p>The abstract is too large: 247 words, and contains mostly generalities. It can be shortened (for instance, the first 6 lines are appropriate for introduction, but not in the abstract) and please at least a couple of bioactive phytochemicals and a couple of vegetables described in the review should be mentioned. Add them to keywords</p> <p>At paragraph 2, it is written: "Chemically, phenolics consist of more than one phenol ring with more than one hydroxyl group". I do not agree with that. One hydroxyl group is enough for phenolics. Two hydroxyl groups are diphenols, and more than two are polyphenols (stilbenes or flavonoids).</p> <p>Figure 3: This figure is too ambiguous. In spite of the effects are variety-dependent, general positive or negative action would be indicated. Anthocianins are mentioned at Figure 2 and some tables, but they are not mentioned at all in that figure 3. Sometimes, it is very difficult to compare (as irrigation parameters mentioned at Table 5 are diverse, RDI, MAD, SDI), but any attempt leading to a higher coordination among Tables and Figure 3 would be helpful.</p>	<p>The first six lines in the abstract have been deleted per suggested. Some examples of phytochemicals, vegetables and fruits have been added in the abstract and keywords.</p> <p>The definition of phenolics has been revised as 'phenolics' is a terminology of family of phenolic compounds including simple phenol containing one hydroxyl group, flavonoids, lignan, and stilbene containing more hydroxyl groups.</p> <p>Figure 3 has been modified and detail information has been added in Figure 3 legend.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Edit the manuscript to correct grammatical errors (especially at the legend of Figure 2). The style of references should be unified. The first one is cited as (names, year) (Dillard and German, 2000), and soon later numbering started [1, 2]. On the other hand, the criteria or the numbering is not clear. It is not order of appearance and it is not alphabetical order. Line 4 of introduction: polyketides are repeated.</p>	<p>Legend of Figure 2 has been corrected.</p> <p>The citation of Dillard and German (2000) has been deleted since the classification of phytochemicals is quite well-known.</p> <p>The citation has been reordered by following the order of their appearance.</p> <p>Line 4 of introduction 'polyketides' has been deleted.</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>Useful review, well referenced, although:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) There are some reiterations that could be eliminated. In that way, the text could be reduced. Examples: The statement that "UVA, UVB and PAR are essential to phenolics or carotenoids biosynthesis due to stimulating the PAL enzyme activity" is repeated at least 3 times. 2) Abstract would be also reduced. The first lines are clearly appropriate for introduction, but they are not necessary in the abstract. 3) Some concepts are described in a very general way, for instance, Fig. 3. 	<p>The repeated 'UVA, UVB, PAR are essential to phenolics or carotenoids biosynthesis due to stimulating the PAL enzyme activity' has been deleted.</p> <p>Abstract has been simplified. In addition, the first 6 lines has been deleted.</p> <p>Figure 3 has been modified.</p>

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>	No, there is no ethical issue in the manuscript.