

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_119396
Title of the Manuscript:	DEVELOPMENT OF FUNCTIONAL WEANIMIX USING SWEET POTATOES FORTIFIED WITH CARROTS
Type of the Article	Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalejns.com/index.php/EJNFS/editorial-policy>)

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>(1) The manuscript titled "DEVELOPMENT OF FUNCTIONAL WEANIMIX USING SWEET POTATOES FORTIFIED WITH CARROTS" is a very good research. The initiative for preparing nutritious food for children from easily available food is very interesting.</p> <p>(2) The title of the manuscript is good.</p> <p>(3) The abstract of the article is comprehensive, but it will be better if the statistical analysis is to be incorporated.</p> <p>(4) Yes</p> <p>(5) Yes.</p> <p>(6) References Strictly follow the Author's Guideline. Some references have not publisher or Journal details.</p> <p>Repeated in the Reference Section Chandrasekara, A., & Josheph Kumar, T. (2016). Roots and tuber crops as functional foods: a review on phytochemical constituents and their potential health benefits. International journal of food science, 2016. Siddiqui, S., Ahmed, N., Devi, C. A., Singh, P. R., & Lalramhlimi, B. (2022). Root Vegetables Having Medicinal Properties: Their Possible Use in Pharmaceutical and Food Industries.</p> <p>(7) Some points to be followed. (a) Strictly follow the Author's Guideline. (b) Grammatical and typological errors to be avoided. (c) 2.2.3 Preparation of Soya beans flour : Avoid the Note. (d) 2.5 Sensory Evaluation: ... "The following attributes namely appearance, aroma, taste, mouthfeel, aftertaste and overall acceptability were assessed on the porridge samples using 5-point hedonic scale was 1= dislike very much, 2=dislike slightly, 3=neither like nor dislike, 4= like slightly, 5= like very much. 30 panelists who were neither sick nor allergic to porridge products were involved in the assessment. The panelists were instruction to rinse their mouth water after tasting each sample." - Provide the information regarding the Human Ethical Clearance. Give details about the selection of 30 panelists with sampling methods. (e) 2.6 Proximate Analysis: Avoided NB/Notes. In each components there were several formulas/equations given, give the equation which was used. (f) 2.7 Carbohydrate: Two formulas/equations given, give the equation which was used. (g) Table 2. Consumer Acceptability of Functional Weanimix. "-Scale; 1- Dislike very much, 2-Dislike slightly, 3-Neither like nor dislike, 4-Like slightly, 5-Like Very much PSC-100 (60% Sweet potato flour: 30% Soybean flour : 10% carrot flour) PSC-200 (50% Sweet potato flour: 30% Soybean flour : 20% carrot flour) PSC-300 (40% Sweet potato flour: 40% Soybean flour : 20% carrot flour)" This was already mentioned in Table 1. The statistical analysis should be incorporate in the Table 2. ANOVA followed by Pos hoc test may help to better explanation of the result. In this table, is was mentioned that Taste and Mouthfeel, PSC100 showed better result than PSC300, explain. (h) Figure 5: Commercially Availability: Graphs should be drawn on the basis of percentage not by number/frequency.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	(i) Figure 6: Reasons for Choice: Graphs should be drawn on the basis of percentage not by number/frequency. (j) Figure 7. Recommendation of Product: Graphs should be drawn on the basis of percentage not by number/frequency. (k) Table 3. Nutrient Composition of Functional Weanimix: Why the nutrient analysis was done only on PSC300? (l) Add a figure of the percentage distribution of panelist in different scale (1- Dislike very much, 2- Dislike slightly, 3-Neither like nor dislike, 4-Like slightly, 5-Like Very much) of the three products of each categories along with chi square analysis.	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	(1) Quite good	
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nirmalya Kumar Sinha
Department, University & Country	Raja Narendralal Khan Women's College (Autonomous), India