

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJFRN_122074</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Fingermillet and Defatted Sesame Seeds Flours as Complementary Foods: Nutritional Evaluation and Protein Quality</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> 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>
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>1. <b>Relevance of the Study</b>: The study addresses a critical issue in nutrition, particularly in developing countries, where complementary foods are crucial for childhood development. The focus on finger millet and defatted sesame seeds as ingredients for complementary foods is highly relevant due to their nutritional potential.</p> <p>2. <b>Scientific Approach</b>: The manuscript presents a well-structured experimental design, with clear methodologies including germination and fermentation processes, amino acid composition analysis, and in-vivo protein evaluation. The study's inclusion of these processes adds depth to the research and aligns with current nutritional science trends.</p> <p>3. <b>Comprehensive Data Presentation</b>: The manuscript effectively presents essential amino acid profiles and in-vivo protein quality indices. Tables and figures are used to provide clear comparisons and results, which enhance the understanding of the study's outcomes.</p> <p>4. <b>Impact on Public Health</b>: By focusing on enhancing the nutritional quality of complementary foods, the study has significant implications for addressing protein-energy malnutrition (PEM) in regions where traditional animal-based proteins are less accessible</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>1. <b>Clarity and Language</b>: While the scientific content is sound, the manuscript could benefit from language editing to improve clarity and readability. Some sections are dense and could be simplified for better comprehension by a broader audience.</p> <p>2. <b>Discussion Depth</b>: The discussion could be expanded to include more detailed comparisons with previous studies. For example, how does the protein quality and amino acid profile of the tested formulations compare to existing complementary foods in the market? Additionally, the potential implications of the findings on local food security and nutrition strategies could be explored further.</p> <p>3. <b>Ethical Considerations</b>: The manuscript mentions that ethical approval is not applicable, but it would be useful to clarify why this is the case, especially considering the use of animal testing. Providing a brief explanation or reference to ethical guidelines followed would strengthen the manuscript's credibility.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>4. <b>Reference Update</b>: Some references could be updated to include the latest research, ensuring that the study is positioned within the most current scientific context.</p> <p>5. <b>Conclusion and Implications</b>: The conclusion could be more robust by summarizing the key findings and their implications for public health policies or recommendations for future research. Emphasizing the practical application of the findings in formulating affordable, nutrient-rich complementary foods could add significant value.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>The manuscript presents valuable research with the potential to contribute significantly to the field of nutrition, particularly in developing countries. By addressing the above areas for improvement, the manuscript could be enhanced to better communicate its findings and impact to a broader audience.</p>	

**Review Form 3**

<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>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>		
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

**PART 2:**

	<p><b>Reviewer's comment</b></p>	<p><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)</p>
<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:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Dajana Vucinic</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Serbia</b></p>