

-----Original Message-----

From: XXX YYY<xxx@yyy.zzz>

Sent: Sat, Jan 25, 2014 at 11:58 PM

To: Managing Editor

Subject: RE: Request for final decision for manuscript number 2013_AJEA_7978

Considering all the comments received from the reviewers, I feel the manuscript can be considered for publication, provided the authors clarify the following comments/questions raised by the reviewers.

Editor's Details:

Kartik Baruah

Department of Animal Production, Ghent University, Belgium

Note: Modification was done in this document ONLY to hide the email id.

Attached Part:

Reviewer 1:

In the result and discussion I reported before 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. In their feedback they mentioned I am talking about radiation alone (The data under raw). If you look to table one the IVPD of irradiated sample alone it is clearly observed that the IVPD was significantly increased it was 35.20, 37.75, 38.47 and 38.86% for the raw samples at 0, 5, 10 and 15 kGy.

It is clearly seem that the results and discussion was revised in the term of the language not according to my suggestion at my previous comments.

(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. 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.)

Reviewer 3:

The manuscript has been significantly improved. I am not an expert on food radiation and health risks thus I cannot consider the side of health risks. Otherwise, the obtained experimental data are clearly presented and the potential outputs of gamma irradiation treatments on nutritional composition of sorghum flour are formulated consistently with the obtained data.

Otherwise, I have only some minor formal comments on the manuscript:

Line 107: Insert the verb “was” in the sentence “...and the tube was tightly closed and incubated....”

Line 132: Insert the verb “was” in the sentence “Tannin content of raw flour was significantly ($P \leq 0.05$) reduced after irradiation....”

Lines 187, 188 and 189: Insert a space between a number and a corresponding unit in “x mg/100 g”

Line 263: Write “glutamic acid” instead of “glutamic”

Line 274: Write “aspartic acid” instead of “aspartic”