

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>European Journal of Nutrition &amp; Food Safety</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_EJNFS_116127</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>QUALITY EVALUATION OF FERMENTED PRE-GELATINIZED UNRIPE PLANTAIN AND SOYBEAN-BASED COMPLEMENTARY FOODS 1: PHYSICOCHEMICAL, SENSORY AND RHEOLOGICAL PROPERTIES</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 1.7**

**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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p><b>1. Is the manuscript important to the scientific community?</b> Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community, as it addresses research on current topics such as gelatinization and natural fermentation. The manuscript is well written, where the authors adopted an appropriate methodology for this type of research and used updated references.</p> <p><b>2. Is the article title appropriate?</b> Yes, the title is appropriate for the content proposed.</p> <p><b>3. Is the article summary comprehensive?</b> Yes, the article summary is quite comprehensive, containing all the main information. The authors cite the benefits of the technology used (gelatinization and natural fermentation for food production). The results found by the authors and the discussion are consistent and robust.</p> <p><b>4. Are the subsections and structure of the manuscript mentioned?</b> Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are making it easier for the reader to understand the different aspects considered.</p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> Yes! An analysis of the manuscript shows that all the procedures of a well-designed research were carried out, employing a review of several updated scientific journals. The results are shown in tables and figures, which facilitates the analysis of the data produced. The discussion is solid and discusses the concepts of gelatinization, natural fermentation and its application as a complementary food.</p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent?</b> Yes! The references are updated (72% less than 10 years old), and relevant to the research proposal.</p> <p>➤ The manuscript is well written and complies with all the procedures of robust research. Therefore, in my opinion, the manuscript is <b>DEFERRED</b> for publication!</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Guido Laercio Bragança Castagnino</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Federal University of Bahia, Brazil</b>