

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_84037
Title of the Manuscript:	PRODUCTION, ASSESSMENT AND SAFETY ASPECT OF WEANING FOOD FROM SORGHUM, CRAYFISH AND GARDEN EGG
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:

(<https://www.journalafsj.com/index.php/AFSJ/editorial-policy>)

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 title should be modified to suit the content. The introduction is not exhaustive. There should be information for the need to blend other cereals with sea food to support complementary feeding beside just giving information on their nutritional composition which is well known.</p> <p>I am not clear with your formulation. I cannot see any control in your formulation (Table 1) though you claim Sorghum and Cerelac as your control. Kindly check your experimental design well. And if there seems to be a problem with the formulation, it means the whole work need to be looked at again. I will advise you use 100% as your bench mark, i.e. all the formulation should add up to 100%</p> <p>Be consistent with your flow chart font and font size (Figures 1, 2 and 3)</p> <p>From the results and discussion, you have stated that some diets were high in minerals than others. I was expecting to see the reasons behind this. What is counting for the increase? How important is the increase in proportion of that raw material to the diet? All these facts are missing. Because the reason for doing this formulation was to see the impact of each food item in the combination that was the reason why you did analyse them individual to know their nutritional composition.</p> <p>Why didn't you do the proximate for the controls? I could see the control in some tables or figures (Fig 3) but absent in some (Table 4, X is present but S is absent and both are control). How do you compare? It will have been more appropriate if you had use an infant formula as the only control (cerelac) and compared it with locally formulated weaning mix as you have done where the combination add up to 100%.</p> <p>The discussion also lacks a lot of literature backing. What the authors did was to tell us the importance of those parameters that were measure but much wasn't said about the influence of the combination yielding the result observed.</p> <p>I did not also see the safety of this work as portrayed in the title.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>The authors compared formulated diet (sorghum, crayfish and garden eggs) against two controls (sorghum and cerelac). These food items are well known especially the sorghum and known for its use as weaning food except the crayfish.</p> <p>These food items are not underutilized and are well known for their use. Again was wondering why the authors used two controls.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Edward Ken Essuman
Department, University & Country	University of Health and Allied Sciences, Ghana