

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_126978
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPLACENCY OF NUTRIENTS WITH RESPECT TO NUTRITION LABELLING IN PACKAGED BAKERY PRODUCTS CARRYING NUTRITION RELATED CLAIMS
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript addresses an important topic for the scientific community, particularly within food science, nutrition, and public health fields. By evaluating the compliance of nutrient claims in packaged bakery products, it sheds light on potential discrepancies that could mislead consumers and impact dietary choices. I appreciate that this study brings attention to the regulatory aspects of food labeling, a growing area of concern as consumers increasingly rely on nutrition labels for healthier food choices. Additionally, the study's focus on a specific food category in an Indian market context fills a critical gap in localized research on food labelling compliance.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, " <i>Complacency of Nutrients with Respect to Nutrition Labelling in Packaged Bakery Products Carrying Nutrition Related Claims</i> ," could be clearer and more precise. The term "complacency" may not fully convey the focus on compliance and accuracy of nutrient claims, which are central to the study. A more suitable title might be: "Compliance of Nutrient Claims with Nutrition Labeling Standards in Packaged Bakery Products"	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract provides a good overview of the study's purpose, methodology, and results, but it could be improved to enhance clarity and comprehensiveness	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	he manuscript's structure is generally appropriate	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness through its systematic approach to assessing compliance with nutrition label claims in packaged bakery products. The study uses established analytical methods, such as AOAC procedures for nutrient analysis, ensuring that the data collected are reliable and reproducible. Furthermore, the use of statistical tests, including t-tests for comparing products with and without nutrition claims, strengthens the validity of the findings. By directly analyzing nutrient content and comparing it to label claims, the manuscript provides objective insights into labeling accuracy, contributing valuable data to the field of nutrition science and consumer protection. However, clarifying sample selection criteria and ensuring consistency in interpreting statistical significance would further strengthen its technical soundness.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references in the manuscript are generally relevant, but they could be updated to include more recent studies, especially those published in the last 3–5 years	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language in the manuscript is mostly suitable for scholarly communication, but there are areas where clarity and precision could be improved to enhance readability and professionalism. Here are some specific points:</p> <p>Word Choice and Terminology: Some terms, such as “complacency” in the title and text, may not convey the intended meaning clearly. Using “compliance” instead of “complacency” would align better with the study’s focus on accuracy and adherence to labeling standards.</p> <p>Sentence Structure and Flow: Certain sentences are lengthy and complex, which may hinder readability. Breaking down complex sentences into shorter, more direct statements would improve flow and clarity.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Future Research: Adding a few lines on future research possibilities, such as exploring consumer understanding of nutrition labels or expanding to other food categories, would demonstrate the study's role within the broader research landscape.</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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ateya Fathy Ateya Morsy
Department, University & Country	Al Azhar University, Egypt