



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJPAC_46199
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATIONS OF RED CABBAGE (BRASSICA OLERACEA L. VAR. CAPITATA F. RUBRA DC.) EXTRACT BEHAVIOR UNDER HIGH DOSE GAMMA IRRADIATION
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:

(<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>Line 55 - 56: what kind of red cabbage did you used? Dried or fresh. what method of grinding: Manual or eletric. Did you seive after grinding? The extraction process should be detail and concise.</p> <p>Line 58-59: The concentration of the acetic acid and sodium hydroxide used should be stated.</p> <p>Line 77-81: This section should be under methodology.</p> <p>Line 107-116: The coloured area should be included in the method involving absorption spectral as I pointed out earlier. Only discussed here the result which you obtained from this evaluation.</p> <p>Line 132-133, 135-142, 165-177: The coloured area should be included in the method involving absorption spectral as I pointed out earlier.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>There should be material section where the instruments and chemical used are listed. Line 62-65 should be within sample preparation, it cannot make a section.</p> <p>Figure 2 and 4 should be improved by increasing the size and brightness for better view. No report of the impact of temperature on the study in the result and discussion.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>Different extraction method should have been tested. There are reports on the use of acetic acid (10% v/v), ethanol, and water as solvents for extraction. check this publication DOI: 10.1016/j.fbp.2012.07.004 (Gachovska et al., 2012) DOI: 10.1590/S1516-89132008000100018 (Xavier et al., 2008) No reference to existing workable isolation method of anthocyanins. This might have accounted for the result observed after irradiation.</p> <p>Line 77-81: No standard anthocyanin dye was used as positive reference to the anthocyanin content of the extract. If this has been done, the effect of other components of the plant on the dosimetry could have been ascertained.</p> <p>Joint FAO/IAEA/WHO Food Standards Program (2003) under the United Nations argued that the higher levels of irradiation (30 kGy) were justified to eliminate bacterial spores (Ashley et al., 2004; Health Concerns Regarding Consumption of Irradiated Food. International Journal of Hygiene and Environmental Health, 1-33). Why did you used 1, 2, 5, 10 kGy doses? This should be mentioned under the discussion having studied the previous work (reference 12). However, this work has contributed to knowledge by using mathematical model to correlate the absorption spectral and dose rate.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

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:	<i>Toluwase Hezekiah Fatoki</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Federal University of Technology, Nigeria</i>