



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>)

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	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 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). 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.	
Minor REVISION comments	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.	
Optional/General comments	Useful review, well referenced, although: 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.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	F. Solano
Department, University & Country	University of Murcia, Spain