



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_30581
Title of the Manuscript:	Formulation, Nutritional Evaluation and Consumer Acceptability of High Energy and Protein dense Complimentary Foods from Millet and soybeans
Type of the 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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1) The author(s) described that the study used response surface methodology (RSM) to find the best composition for the complimentary food, and conclude that the best composition is 50% soybean. It is not clear for me how the author(s) conclude this, since no RSM result presented by the author. When RSM used in an experiment, a mathematical model should be presented and confirmed by experiments. Including the optimum (best) condition based on the model need to be confirmed. The author(s) need to include a contour plot and a model for the RSM result to show the reader how the author(s) draw the conclusions. 2) The author(s) mentioned that ash content increased with higher soybean composition. When discussing this result, author compare to a work using cactus pear. If it is possible, the author(s) need to determine individual ash value of the starting materials (especially soybean), to show that soybean has the highest ash content, and therefore significantly increase the ash content of the end product.	What it means was that soybeans could be added up to 50% without changes in sensory properties like flavour and taste. But however, it has been corrected. Mathematical models have been designed in my corrected manuscripts. Please take note. Noted and corrected in manuscripts. Please check.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1) There are some missing units on the abstracts and other part of the manuscript, e.g. for protein content, fat content, moisture content, peak viscosity 2) The author(s) should add a space between value and unit. For some units such as kcal, kg, mm a space should be added between the value and the unit (e.g. 10 mm), while for %, °C no space should be added (e.g. 15%). 3) Line 86: period should be placed at the end of the sentence, not a comma	Noted and corrected in my manuscripts. Please check. Noted and corrected. Please note.

	4) Line 101: written → Kcal should be → kcal 5) Line 110: missing space → Brabenderviskograph-E(Brabender OHG, Duisberg, Germany) should be Brabender viskograph-E (Brabender OHG, Duisberg, Germany) 6) Line 123: past tense should be used for this sentence: "The panelists will be asked to indicate their ..." because it already performed 7) Author used different term on Table 1 and Table 3 for the non-coded variables. Same term should be used to avoid confusion. 8) Line 242: Means in the same column followed having difference greater than LSD are significantly different at 5% level of probability → does it mean if value of two means higher than the LSD it is significantly different? 9) Does "Means" value on the table on formulation column necessary for the discussion? Because it confuse reader with the formulation.	Noted and corrected. Please note. Noted and corrected. Please note. Noted and corrected. Please note. Noted and corrected. Please note.
Optional/General comments	The manuscript provide useful data to fight malnutrition. Therefore I recommend this manuscript for publication provided that some feedbacks (as mentioned above) can be accommodated and/or responded.	Thank you sir. But however, i had problem with my data, so i went back to the Laboratory which has affected most of my results. Therefore, you may experience changes in my results.