



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJPAC_48478
Title of the Manuscript:	STANDARDIZATION AND EVALUATION OF CAULIFLOWER STALKS INCORPORATED PHULKAS
Type of the 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**

	<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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Abstract.</b> The abstract does not explicitly the aim of the investigation. The methodology reported in the abstract is not properly raised, it lacks the experimental design corresponding to the incorporation "phulkas at 5, 10 , and 15%". In the abstract, do not mention the variables recorded nor the corresponding statistical analysis.</p> <p><b>Materials and methods</b> The methodology is not properly raised. No specifications on the type of components of stalks and other ingredients cauliflower. It does not specify the proportion of stalks and other ingredients cauliflower. The Sensory analysis of cauliflower stalks phulkas powder incorporated, require mayors information. It is important specify the procedure Meilgaard <i>et al.</i>, (1999), where the phulkas and cauliflower stalks were carried out by fifteen semi-trained panellists using 5-Point hedonic scale and were Scored for color, texture, flavor, taste and overall acceptability. The methodology lacks a corresponding experimental design and statistical analysis. The methodology does not specify the chemical test, phytochemical screening and analysis of physical properties. Specify the procedures used to determine: alkaloids, proteins, amino acids, flavonoids, fixed oils, terpenoids, cardiac glycosides, steroids, tannins, phlobatins, phenols and quinones.</p> <p><b>RESULTS &amp; discussion</b> The following paragraph presented with the results correspond rather to the methodology that the results, "The preliminary tests for carbohydrates, alkaloids, proteins, amino acids, flavonoids, oils fixed, terpenoids, cardiac glycosides, steroids, tannins, phlobatins, phenols and quinones were Carried out as per the procedure Given by Harborne, 1993." It is recommended to move this paragraph to the section of Materials &amp; Methods.  The phytochemical compounds in dried cauliflower stalks incorporated phulkas, where carbohydrates, alkaloids, protein, flavonoids, phenols, amino acids, cardiac glycosides, steroids, saponins and tannins. Alkaloids and Steroids were carried out; they were not properly discussed and compared with the results of other authors.  Both results on phytochemical as physical characteristics of developed phulkas, are descriptive type and do not add new knowledge in the area of crop production nor on the photochemistry and nutritional products. It is required to register the information with a solid support on statistical on physical and phytochemical of the products.</p>	<p>Thank you for your evaluations. We have modified accrodingly</p>



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	In summary, the present manuscript requires depth restructuring from the methodological point of view and the interpretation of results, since under the current scheme is not recommended for the publication.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Introduction</b> Change "Campbell, 2012" to "Campbell et al., 2012" and "Kulakarni, 2001" to "Kulakarni, et al., 2001". Change "Oberio <i>et al</i>, 2007 and Ferreira <i>et al</i>, 2013.." To "Oberio <i>et al</i> . , 2007; Ferreira <i>et al</i>, 2013 ".</p> <p>The introduction highlights the following aspects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The phenolic compounds low molecular weight With plant secondary metabolites of fruits and vegetables.</li> <li>2. The high consumption of vegetables is associated these with a decreased risk of cardiovascular diseases, cancer and degenerative pathologies.</li> <li>3. The biochemical and nutrient content edible portion of cauliflower is rich source of which iron and <math>\beta</math>- carotene and THUS can be utilized in to preparing value added products.</li> </ol> <p>However, information about the economic importance and national production (India) are not reported. Nor they do not include the cauliflower consumed per capita by the people of India.</p>	All are corrected
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

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