

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_85532
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Studies on the Physicochemical Characteristics and Lipid Contents of Desert Date (<i>Balanites aegyptiaca</i> (L.) Del) Kernel and Pulp Oils
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:

(<https://www.journalejnfs.com/index.php/EJNFS/editorial-policy>)

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 Author(s) should go through my comments on the manuscript. There are issues with the use of GC for the determination of phospholipids and sterols. If the Author(s) address these issues, the MS can be sent to me again.	(a) I did not see any comments on the manuscripts regarding phospholipids and sterols determinations. However, I want to state here that the results we have on the two parameters are genuine.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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) Yes. The procedures used for analysis were not clearly stated. Official analytical methods have codes. The code of a method used for a particular analysis must be stated. This must be done to prevent assumption of fabrication of results	(a) There are no ethical issues. (b) However, in order to satisfy the curiosity of the Reviewer, we have included the website of validation methods of AOAC in the reference. (c) The authors wish to inform Editor that we have all the procedures of physicochemical parameters which deliberately are removed from the paper in order to reduce volume.