



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_49294
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative evaluation of antioxidant potential in thermally processed, underutilized food grains of the Himalayan region
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>)

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	Methods: 2.3: Temperature of the thermal processing should be given (at least approximate values) for pan covered and pressure cooking).	
Minor REVISION comments	Improve the quality of Figure 1. Higher contrast is needed. 80% Acidified methanol pH 2: clarify the acid used for this preparation Filterate= filtrate? Format of Tables should also be improved. P value for significant ana non-significant statistical relevance would be helpful	
Optional/General comments	Good introduction and appropriate references. However, the differences among acid phenols, polyphenols and flavonoids should be clearly established. These terms are used without a clear distinction in methods for antioxidant capacity, FRAP and DPPH. For instance, at line 49, isoquercetin and rutin are presented as polyphenols. Differences between antioxidant capacity using FRAP and DPPH should also be discussed. What are the reasons to use both methods	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	F. Solano
Department, University & Country	University of Murcia, Spain