



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJTDH_11949
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of The Nutrient Content of Infant Complementary Food Fortificant - Moringa oleifera Leaves with the Commonly Consumed Local Infants Foods in Nigeria: Zea mays and Glycine max
Type of the Article	Short communication

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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	Line 54: What is PEM? Please, write whole sentence. Line 75-81: Is described method of bran removing and maize flour fermentation commonly used as method for maize processing in Nigeria? Why is such processing method important? It should be mentioned, because it is not common technology in other parts of the world. Moreover, maize bran contains lot of protein, mineral elements and majority of β-carotene. Line 84-88: Similar as for maize, processing method needs explanation. Line 100: Atwater factor" formula – please, introduce reference for formula. Line 102-104: Method described by Ranjham and Gapal was not used for determination of mineral elements, but for sample preparation (wet digestion). Was determination obtained by atomic absorption spectrophotometric method? You haven't mentioned properly. Line 108, 117: Table 1 presents composition and energy of analysed food materials. You haven't analysed energy composition, as well as it is chemical composition of food material. In accordance with that, table caption should be corrected. In table nutrient should be changed to component. What is CHO? You should choose which table (1 or 2) to leave in manuscript and which one to exclude. They are based on the same data. Line 121-127: In accordance with upper comment, this part of text should be avoided or include instead of text in lines 108-115. Line 132-149: Same as upper comments, one table should be excluded, together with following text.	Thank you for the good corrections. However, please take a look at the tables again, you will notice that it is based on dry matter and processed basis. It is quite different data, they are not identical. The processing method is thus added in the methodology.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 154: Instead “Proximate and energy composition of maize, soybean and <i>Moringa oleifera</i> leaf” should be “composition and energy of maize and soybean grain and <i>Moringa oleifera</i> leaves” Line 156: You compare own results with results of Ihekoronye and Ngodi. How they achieved lower protein content? From processed maize or something else? Line 157: microflora hydrolysis should be changed into microbiological hydrolysis. Line 165-167: Why is that important for your experiment and data analysis? Line 171-177: You used maize and soybean grain which are low in fibre. Are the literature data also presents fibre content in grains, or other parts of plants? Moreover, using of soybean grain as infant complementary food could be problematic, due to antinutrients, present in its grain, so the conclusion based just on one parameter (crude fibre) is insufficient. Line 180: put the reference number by the author name, not at the end of sentence. Line 188-190: Please, avoid such statements.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Language is poor and it is hard to read manuscript. It must be corrected. Authors have used literature data just to compare which nutrient was in greater or lesser concentration in their material, than in results of other authors. Fortification is important issue and many different authors are working trying to give best combination of food, including nutrients and nutrients, with the highest intake of mineral nutrients. Manuscript is generally weak. Based just on analysis of some factors, it is unable to get any conclusion about possible effect of analysed foods on human health. If authors suggest addition of Moringa leaves into processed maize and soybean grain, which ratio should be the best? Authors haven't included any of antinutrients which affect absorption of mineral elements. If authors had intent to analyse additions of fortificants, why they choose only Moringa, not some other medical plants, to compare. Then study would have much more sense and scientific significance.	