

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">European Journal of Nutrition &amp; Food Safety</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_129424
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Macronutrient and Selected Micronutrient Contents of Peanut Butter Fortified with Moringa Leaf Powder
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

### Review Form 3

#### PART 1: 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>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The research is very important because it addresses the problem of nutritional deficiency in many countries of the world, especially poor countries whose children suffer from hunger and nutrition-related diseases.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the article is appropriate and it is clear, concise and informative. It accurately reflects the content of the research, which is fortification of peanut butter with Moringa leaf powder	
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.	Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive. It provides a good overview of the research question, methodology, results, and implications of the study. The abstract is also well-written and easy to read.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, I think the manuscript is scientifically correct. The methodology is good, and the results are presented in a clear and concise manner. Only in methodology the experimental treatments and the studies parameter were not exactly described (see comment in manuscript text)	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, the references are sufficient and up to date. The authors cite a variety of relevant sources, including recent papers.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	In general, I think the manuscript is well-written and informative. It makes a significant contribution to the field of food science and it is likely to be of interest to a wide range of researchers. The author have to take the correction and recommendation in consideration (see comment in manuscript text)	

#### 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:	Abdulkarim Abdulmageed Amad
Department, University & Country	Thamar University, Yemen