



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ EJNFS _48885
Title of the Manuscript:	NUTRITIVE AND NON-NUTRITIVE PRINCIPLES OF RIPE AND UNRIPE Dennettia tripetala FRUITS
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>)

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 paper analyzed some nutritive chemicals and non-nutritive components with ripe and unripe DT fruits. At first, the title is not clear and not correct expression with the research topic. The authors should give exact conclusion about the benefit of ripe and unripe DT fruits. Although, the paper analyzed some nutritive components and some secondary metabolites as well as minerals, no obvious valuable significance were found from these data. Any plants or horticultural products have their unique chemicals and have their special application potentials including DT. We disagree that conclusion "the consumption of DT fruits can boost metabolism, reproductive function, neuronal function and antioxidant function" with the present study. In abstract part, Arsenic element should be expressed as As instead of Ar. In summary, the paper have no obvious novelty in the related field.	Title modified Exact conclusion has modified Ar changed to As Significance has been stated.
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)	No ethical issues