

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFRN_98483
Title of the Manuscript:	NUTRITIONAL QUALITY OF COMPLEMENTARY PORRIDGE MADE FROM YELLOW MAIZE, PUMPKIN SEEDS, SOYBEANS AND CARROTS FOR FEEDING CHILDREN AGED 6-24MONTHS.
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://journalajfrn.com/index.php/AJFRN/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)	Yes, it is more than important for the scientific community. Yes, it is suitable. The abstract lacks the analysis methods part and a final recommendation; the other parts are included. The structure of the manuscript as well as the subsections are in order. To some extent yes, there are small shortcomings such as the statistical analyzes that I have highlighted. I think the references are sufficient and recent.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript after some improvements that need to be made (which I have highlighted in the manuscript) will be more complete for publication	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Gafur Xhabiri
Department, University & Country	University of Tetova, North Macedonia