

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_EJNFS_119959 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Awareness About Nutritional Benefits of Millets Among Young Adults |
| 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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes. It is important that people are aware of small grain cereals because of their sustainability to food security and their valuable nutraceutical properties, hence the knowledge generated could contribute to existing literature on small grain cereals. 2. The title is suitable but it could be improved by including the location of the study so that the results are contextual. Also if the location is included the indigenous names of the millets could be contextualised to the region because different regions have specific names for the different millets. It's also important for the author to define young adults in this study because the term young adults is a relative term which could have different category of ages. 3. The abstract should be comprehensive to capture the type of the study, aim/objective/s, conclusions, recommendations and the significance/impact of the study 4. Throughout the manuscript, except for literature review, there are no references, which makes the article less of an academic paper. The author should acknowledge the works borrowed especially on factual information, where claims are made and where dates are concerned. 5. The author needs to polish up on the articulation of the methodology used: the approach and the design and methods. There is need is need to attend to the questions asked, data analysis and discussion to make the manuscript scientifically correct 6. I suggest the literature review should be narrative and in paragraph forms instead of numbering. The author should also be critical of the literature reviewed in relation to various other studies closely related to the present study which should set the bench mark and tone for comparing or contrasting the findings. A good attempt was made to use current sources but more could have been reviewed to build a bases for a critical analysis, discussion and conclusions of the study. <p>No style of referencing was adhered to both in text and the reference list. Only sources cited should have appeared on the reference list. The reference list should have been in alphabetical order.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | <p>There is need to improve on the layout of the manuscript. There is a lot of numbering in the article resulting in the loss of the significance of the numbering. Paragraphing could improve the</p> | |

Review Form 1.7

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | presentation and depth of content on the numbered points. Bolding only is enough for the subheadings without underlying. There is also need for thorough proof reading. A language editor could be engaged to improve on the quality of the language. | |
| <u>Optional/General</u> comments | <p>There was need for an in-depth literature review on the subject of the study which could have assisted in the presentation of the manuscript in both style and content.</p> <p>Data presentation and analysis needs improvement. The content should be broken down according to items analysed instead of just one long sentences. There is also need for inferences and discussion of the results. No discussion was noted in the manuscript. Literature review was missing in this section and so were the other sections.</p> <p>A lot of proof reading was essential before submission. A language expert or editor could have been sought for assistance.</p> <p>There are no paragraphs in the manuscript.</p> | |

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> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name: | Misozi Chiweshe |
| Department, University & Country | University of Zimbabwe, Zimbabwe |