

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_125196
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation Of Dietary Properties Of Complementary Food Produced From Grains Blend And Pigeon Pea
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>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.</p>	<p>This study is significant as it addresses the need for affordable and nutritious complementary foods for infants, particularly in resource-limited settings. By blending co-fermented maize, millet, and pigeon pea, the formulations offer a balanced nutritional profile, rich in proteins, essential minerals, and energy. The investigation into the functional, physico-chemical, and anti-nutritional properties ensures that the food is not only nutritious but also safe and suitable for infant consumption. Additionally, the study provides a cost-effective solution for combating malnutrition during critical early growth stages.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>I think there is a need to change the title of this manuscript. I recommend- "Formulation and Assessment of Nutritious Infant Complementary Foods from Co-Fermented Maize, Millet, and Pigeon Pea Blends".</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract is fine but please write the required SI units , they are all missing in many places</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound because it employs a comprehensive approach by evaluating multiple crucial parameters—proximate, nutritional, physico-chemical, functional, and anti-nutritional properties—of the infant food formulations. The use of co-fermentation enhances the nutrient availability while minimizing anti-nutritional factors, which is key for infant health. The inclusion of sensory evaluation strengthens the practical applicability, ensuring that the formulations are not only nutritious but also acceptable to consumers. Additionally, the systematic comparison of different blends provides valuable insights for optimizing complementary food development.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>References are sufficient and recent references are included so need to of editing</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Language is fine</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Try to edit some more scientifically sound explanation in discussion part</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Anushree R K
Department, University & Country	Vasantao Naik Marathwada Krishi Vidyapeeth, India