

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_98090
Title of the Manuscript:	SAFETY EVALUATION OF FONIO (DIGITARIA EXILIS)/ RICEBEAN (VIGNA UMBELLATA) BASED 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:

<https://www.journalejns.com/index.php/EJNFS/editorial-policy>)

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. Yes it is important for scientific community because the research will helpful for infant nutrition management 2. Ok 3. Ok but abstract should be made one para 4. Ok 5. The manuscript is written by scientific back ground and scientifically correct but need to include in citation more recent and relevant references 6. Add more and recent references. References should be written by EJNF style. Two references is missing in the references chapter (Ezeama, 2008 and Harborne 1976 T). Alignments should be justify.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	1. Should be written Table (capital T not small letter) 2. Flow chart make it one page 3. Table 2-make it one page 4. Materials and methods chapter is ok 5. Results and discussion chapter is ok and has written on actual facts and figures but need to add more recent and relevant references 6. Statistical analysis has been done 7. Two citation are missing in the references chapter	

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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lam Yea Asad
Department, University & Country	Sher-e-Bangla Agricultural University, Bangladesh