



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_7978
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of radiation process followed by traditional treatments on nutritional quality of high tannin sorghum cultivar
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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

	acids composition and score were significantly decreased. <u>Introduction</u> The introduction was relevant; however, the literature citation used by the authors was inadequate and still needs more elaboration, through addition of citations from most recent studies in the area of combination of radiation process with traditional methods, which could be very helpful to the authors in discussion and enlightenment of the obtained results. Actually, radiation processing is used for controlling stored pest in grains during storage, and the recommended dose is about 1 kGy, therefore, the authors should explain why they used these high doses in the objectives. Since high radiation doses are used for investigate changes on functional quality of flour. <u>Materials and methods</u> Radiation process:	I think no need to add any other citations Up to 15 kGy is Ok and we reported this in previous publications.
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Did the initial moisture content change during irradiation? Has this any significance for this study? As the samples were sealed hermetically, how could moisture content change? (All experiments were repeated 3 times and 3 replicates of each flour type were irradiated)..... unclear sentence. (Radiated and non-radiated flour of the cultivar was naturally fermented till the pH of the dough reached 4.50 and thereafter cooked for 20 min in a water bath and then dried and ground to pass a 0.4 mm screen for further analysis) is this belong to radiation process? In my opinion this should be under other subtitle. <u>Results and discussion</u> 1. The discussion was done in classical way, just by comparing results obtained from the study with other investigators. No deepness in discussion was mentioned and seen. Also no clear conclusions have been drawn from this important study.	All these are explained in materials and methods section and as I mentioned what we report is enough for the reader to understand the work. This belong to processes followed radiation 1 Revised
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Therefore more explanation and elaboration in this part of the manuscript is considered necessary. For examples: No explanation about the reasons how can radiation processing decrease tannin and phytic acid. 2. The authors mentioned in their results: Radiation of raw flour was found to be effective in improving the IVPD at low dose of 5 KGy but as the level of radiation increased the IVPD significantly ($P \leq 0.05$) decreased. According to IVPD results in table 1 this statement is not corrected. Authors should revise their work and results before submitting. <u>Conclusion</u> No clear conclusions have been drawn from this important study.	2 I am talking about radiation alone (The data under raw)
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		