



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>)

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>	
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>	
Optional/General comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

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.

Kindly see the following link:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Gisele Kirchbaner Contini</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>State University of Central, Brazil</i>