

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_85793
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of pretreatments combined to sun and oven drying and canning methods on lovastatin content of <i>Pleurotus ostreatus</i>
Type of the Article	Original 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>)

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>1) The research title needs revisiting and perhaps revising. For more information, go to the details of comments on the title. It does not mean that there will be a change in the essence or idea of the title and the whole work. But, my stand is that it should ne re-written again in smart ways.</p> <p>2) Re-organization of the methodology section required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The methodology section needs to re-organized for making the manuscript more attractive and scietific. I do not mean that the ideas in each sub-section are not desirable. They are desirable but, the way sub-sections are organized is not attractive.- Since the study methodology is basically experimental, I would prefer reorganizing of the subsections as : 2.1. Research design (include what you wrote in sub-section of 2.4.2 2.2. Pre-treatment process You can include here subsections, 2.1., 2.2., 2.3., 2.4.1., 2.2. Experimental process 2.2.1. Treatment and its subsections as they are <p>3) The conclusionpart must be revised. The authors only summarized their findings. But, they do not draw conclusion. What is written here is a brief summary of the findings. But, it is not concluded. In other words, what is learnt from the findings must be drawn at this level. So, based on the summary of the findings, draw your conclusion.</p>	<p>Your remarks are relevant and have all been taken into account. The title as well as the methodology part has been revised as proposed, the conclusion has been completed.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Sub-section 2.5. may be re-orgnaised as:</p> <p>2.5. Method of data analysis</p> <p>2.5.1. Preparation of lovastatin standard and standard curve</p> <p>But, delete sub section 2.6 and include the idea under this section as introduction to Sub-section 2.5. (i.e. method of data analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Your keywords are not words. They are phrases and some are sentences. Focus on key words that you think can express your manuscript.	<p>The rearrangements of the sub-sections have been done as proposed and the key words rectified.</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>Generally, the following sections of the manuscript are well done:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Introduction,- Experimental procedure the authors pursued,- Results and discussion methods they used. <p>But, they should consider the following corrections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Minor language editing is required. For example, some editing problems (in abstract,) that seem minor may affect the quality the paper adversely.- Content organization (Methodology section)- Conclusion needs to be complete as recommended above.	

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>	There are no ethical problems in this manuscript