



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	Experimental design

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	<p>This paper in several aspects is not enough informative, thus, at its current form, does not meet the criteria for novelty and also not is scientifically robust and technically sound. My major comments are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.The analytical methods and assays are quite "routine" which make the accuracy of this paper questionable. The limitations of photometric methods in (poly)phenol analysis are well known, whereas HPLC methods might have been useful to describe the individual phenolic compounds in the underutilized grains. 2.The results appear to be too preliminary. Authors should include some investigations on physical or chemical properties such as proximate composition, tannins, anthocyanins and individual phenolic compounds. 3.The results and discussion appears to be descriptive rather than mechanistic, which leaves this reviewer with the impression that scientific depth is missing. 	
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)	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Vivian Cristina Ito</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>State University of Ponta Grossa, Brazil</i>