

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_101993
Title of the Manuscript:	Baby-Led Cookies Produced from Rice, Banana and Cashewnut Flour Blends: Physicochemical and Nutritional Properties
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The manuscript is beneficial to scientific community because the researcher has methodically demonstrated how he was able to reach to a conclusion on the most nutritious finger food for weaning children. The finding adds to the body of knowledge on child feeding.</p> <p>The title is simplified. It would have been better if the comparative method used to reach the conclusion was added into the title to make it more discursive.</p> <p>The abstract has captured key areas of the research in a comprehensive manner and to the point.</p> <p>The structure of the manuscript is well discussed from introduction, methodology, to results before drawing a conclusion. It precise.</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct because it has followed scientific steps to draw conclusions by comparing several products including a control.</p> <p>The references are sufficient. There are a few references that dates back to 2004 and 2006 but they are from authoritative sources guiding analysis of quality control processes.</p> <p>The researcher has described precisely how to identify the most suitable baby-lend cookies by developing and testing the products from raw materials and comparing with commercially made cookies and has demonstrated the nutritional value of each before advocating for the most suitable product. This scientifically sound process has brought new knowledge that add to the body of knowledge.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is suitable for scholarly communication, though there are several scientific terms especially in methodology that are particular to laboratory-based studies.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Good work here on child nutrition.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> This is a laboratory-based study so no much ethical issues. Maybe the ethical considerations on choice of panellists is not very well explained. Who were the panellists, what was the inclusion criteria?	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Catherine Wangu Shitemi
Department, University & Country	Kenya