

[ReviewForm1.7](#)

JournalName:	<a href="#">EuropeanJournalofNutrition&amp;FoodSafety</a>
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_EJNFS_115971
TitleoftheManuscript:	ExploringMilletGrains:NutritionalBenefits,ProcessingAdvancements,andFutureDirectionsforFoodSecurityandHealthImprovement
TypeoftheArticle	

**ReviewForm1.7**

**PART1:ReviewComments**

	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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The manuscript is of importance to the scientific community as it explores the benefits that millets have over other cereals. However, the authors need to do justice on discussion how competitive millets are over other cereals including challenges that are faced in throughout the millet value chain. They have just provided general information; this manuscript should be a critical review for it to gain merit.</li> <li>2. The title of manuscript is suitable.</li> <li>3. The abstract is not comprehensive. It should be revised after the author has done a major revision to the whole manuscript. Comments are included in the manuscript attached.</li> <li>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate but they lack detailed information, as indicated earlier the authors should be present a critical review of millets, not just present general information. In addition the authors should include a section on methodology narrating how information used to write the manuscript was searched. The methodology should include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Articles used where from which years?</li> <li>- Which search engines were used</li> <li>- What were the keywords used in the search for articles included in the review</li> <li>- What was the main criteria for inclusion of articles in the review</li> <li>- Indicate countries where the research articles were from and which millets including the scientific names.</li> <li>- What was the exclusion criteria?</li> </ul> <p>Then there should be a results section where the authors should narrate the number of papers identified by their search. How many papers were excluded and why? You can even have a flow diagram summarising the whole process. Also indicated which countries the accepted research papers were from and the numbers of papers from each country? You can also have a table indicating countries, the types of millets and the processing advancements?</p> <p>After the results have a discussion which different subsections. Additional comments have been made in the manuscript attached.</p> <p>It is surprising that the authors did not include references in the text of the manuscript, this is a standard scientific writing. Please include references in the text not just list them at the end of the manuscript.</p> </li> <li>5. The manuscript is scientifically sound but lacks depth details for it to have merit for publication.</li> <li>6. The number of references is fine but normally it is good to use references not more than 10 years old unless if it is justified. The authors should define in the methodology section the years.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>The language quality is good.</p>	

**ReviewForm1.7**

<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The manuscript is too general, please address the comments in the manuscript to give depth to this article. The manuscript as it is, is too shallow you in depth discussion on the nutrient content of the millets including their bioactive discussion. Then result the abstract to include more detail on nutrition value and processing advancement.	
----------------------------------	---	--

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Loveness K. Nyanga</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Zimbabwe, Zimbabwe</b>