



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_48096
Title of the Manuscript:	Proximate composition, Functional and Sensory Properties of Pearl Millet, Soy flour and Baobab Fruit Pulp Composite flour as a Complementary Food
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

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>In the introduction you should talk more about each raw material used.</p> <p>References for introduction should be more recent.</p> <p>would not the moisture analysis by the AOAC method be 105 ° C instead of 103 ° C?</p> <p>The time in hours that the ashes were left, do they have this information?</p> <p>Please clarify how the food supplement was used? Were the flours mixed with water and children's food added? In question the children who has hampered how much breast milk how would be made?</p> <p>The sensory analysis for a good statistical result must be done with at least 50 untrained judges. How did you justify having only 30 judges?</p>	<p>Added</p> <p>I may wish to differ a little about the references because even most analytical method for example employed in our research are obtained from old sources. Authors could cite them say in 2019 etc but it does not mean they were made that year e.g Onabanjo <i>et al</i>, 2009 cited ref. of 1995, 1997 and 1998 etc. If they carry the message, I think it should be appreciated sir.</p> <p>Page 9 line 203: 103 ° C corrected to 105 ° C. those are the percentage of baobab fruit pulp.</p> <p>Page 11 line 260: time was 2 hrs. corrected</p> <p>The supplement was added in various percentages as shown in the keys under each table. It was prepared with hot boiling water and served to the panellist. I do not get clearly the last part of the question but, complementary feeding does not terminate breast feeding but helps to supply additional nutrient(s) which breast milk may not be able to provide at this stage of the child's development.</p> <p>Sensory evaluation must not be centred on untrained judges only as there are semi-trained judges etc who could be used, depending on the researcher's preference methodology and target population. Semi-trained judges were selected for this study after screening and they were well distributed. From the sensory table, a minimum of 10 judges could be used.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>I could not understand the method of gelling, as you did to determine, by weight difference between what gelled and what was left of water?</p> <p>How were the samples prepared to serve the judges in the sensory analysis?</p> <p>Was it considered standard sample with 50% corn flour and 50% soybean meal? So the variation would be just about the baobab fruit pulp flour?</p>	<p>The gelation was determined on the concentration which did slide down after cooling.</p> <p>They were made into slurry with boiling water and served at room temp.</p> <p>All the raw material were put into perspective based n their individual contribution but that of baobab fruit pulp was emphatic because it's novelty in complementary feeding.</p>
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.



SDI Review Form 1.6

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>