



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_39539
Title of the Manuscript:	Biochemical, nutritional and end use perspectives of Wheat grass as potential dietary supplement
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>)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Line 11: There are many abbreviations in the abstract. Some of them are explained below, but some not (like TSS). I think that full names along with abbreviations should be used in place when they first appear. It would make the abstract more approachable. Line 203: It is not juice! According to AIJN juice contains only processed fruits without sugar, preservatives etc. Please change the name to drink or beverage. Line 294: Please add some conclusions from your work. Line 395: Antioxidative activity is not part of composition. It should not be placed in the figure.	Comments were very clear and useful. Abbreviation issue is tried to be solved. The word of juice is now used in manuscript for only pure juice obtained after crushing of wheat grass with added water only. The word of juice is replaced with drink when other ingredients are mixed with it. Antioxidant activity portion is added to assess the possible health boosting potential of wheat grass and supplemented cookies
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The quality of work is good. I recommend accepting it after minor revisions (listed above).	