



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		
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>The overall aim of the present study was to estimate and compare the total antioxidant capacity, total phenolics and total flavonoids content in five underutilized crops of the state of Uttarakhand, India. Among grains, dehusked barnyard millet and amaranth seeds were investigated, while among pulses, black soybean, rice bean and horse gram were taken in analysis. Therefore, this paper contributes to the improving the knowledge in this research topic by communicating important results about the antioxidant properties of mentioned crops. Moreover, the changes in antioxidant properties of the underutilized crops were evaluated as a result of applying different processing techniques (covered pan cooking and pressure cooking).</p> <p>Some appreciations can be done about this manuscript, as follows: the Introduction gives a suitable background of the addressed issue and it also shows the significance of the research theme; the objectives are appropriate to the mentioned purpose; the experiments have been rigorously conducted; the results are well emphasized and support the addressed issues. Also, the conclusions are of the great interest and they have support the obtained results. The reported data revealed that the black soybean is the richest source of bioactive compounds among investigated crop samples. This reinforces the health benefits of black soybean followed by rice bean whereas barnyard millet and amaranth have lower bioactive potential as compared to pulses. It was concluded that the bioactive compounds were reduced in response to both processing methods. In the case of barnyard millet, pressure cooking was found better than covered pan cooking in terms of losses recorded in antioxidant characteristics in response to thermal processing. This may be due to the prolonged cooking time in the latter method. As regards the pulses, it may be concluded that, covered pan cooking yielded the better results as compared to pressure cooking in terms of lesser losses of bioactive compounds and total antioxidant capacity.</p> <p>Moreover, this study benefits from the support of 28 references, relevant for this research topic and correctly cited. Although the manuscript has been written in a standard English, unambiguous, I recommend a carefully check of the manuscript to correct any grammatical or syntax errors.</p> <p>Based on these mentions, I recommend this manuscript for publication.</p>	

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>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Mariana-Atena POIANA</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Banat's University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine, Romania</i>