



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_37833
Title of the Manuscript:	FORMULATION AND EVALUATION OF READY-TO-USE THERAPEUTIC FOODS USING LOCALLY AVAILABLE INGREDIENTS IN BAUCHI, NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Original 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/30/editorial-policy>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The topic of the manuscript is interesting and the proposed products serve a fine purpose. The use of English language is satisfactory as well. However, the manuscript needs some adjustments. More specifically, abstract should not contain parts of the experimental process. It should only state the purpose of the study, the methodology applied and summarize major findings.</p> <p>Introduction should not include the exact same phrases used in the abstract. It should be more specific and provide information on the products developed. For instance it should justify the local availability of all raw materials used and how their proportions were chosen. Were they based on the formulation of PLUMPY'NUT or were they based on preliminary experiments?</p> <p>Materials and methods is over explanatory in some points. For example it is not necessary to describe in a scientific paper how the soxhlet extractor is mounted. Only necessary information which offers the possibility of repeating measurements from other researchers should be included. Several methods used lack references. Authors should also provide reference on how the processing conditions applied for the preparation of each flour were chosen?</p> <p>In the results section all eight cereal, legume and oils mixtures formulated should be presented since authors declare that they were all evaluated. Even if they did not satisfy the criteria for the final product, they will reinforce the manuscript with more data and enrich it. In my opinion, sensory evaluation should also include PLUMPY'NUT since authors consider it the target product and compare its nutritional characteristics with those of their resulting products.</p> <p>As far as the cost for the production of the proposed products is concerned, how was it calculated? Does it include the cost for equipment, energy and labour?</p> <p>Finally, conclusions should be further expanded and enriched with the outcome of the study.</p> <p>More comments can be found within the reviewed manuscript.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Some sentences are incomplete and should be thoroughly checked.</p> <p>The numbers of replication for each test should be reported and SD values should be embedded were missing.</p> <p>References and units used should be checked for uniformity issues.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Virginia Giannou
Department, University & Country	School of Chemical Engineering, Laboratory of Food Chemistry and Technology, National Technical University of Athens, Greece