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|  | **Reviewer’s comment**  **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | **Author’s Feedback** (It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
| **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.** | This manuscript is an important, thorough review that summarizes the state of science about millets' nutritional makeup and health benefits. It gives the scientific community a strong database to explore the therapeutic potential of millets in treating and preventing non-communicable diseases by combining various study findings. Furthermore, to guide future scientific endeavours and promote cooperative efforts towards mainstreaming millets in global nutrition strategies, the review identifies important areas for future research, such as the development of sustainable supply chain models and clinical validation of health claims. Researchers, decision- makers, and public health experts can all benefit from its multidisciplinary approach, which spans nutrition, food science, and agricultural resilience. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | Yes, the title of the article, "Nutritional Composition and Health Advantages of Millets in Contemporary Dietary Practices – A Review," is highly suitable |  |
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| **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.** | The provided abstract is highly comprehensive and well-structured. It effectively covers all the essential elements of a strong scientific abstract with few minor corrections-   1. Currently, the abstract mentions "low glycemic index" and "high antioxidant potential." While the detailed paper will have specific numbers, a very brief, high-level, illustrative number could be added if space permits and it doesn't make the abstract too dense. For example, "Millets, such as finger millet (rich in calcium, ∼350 mg/100g), are emerging as..." However, this often makes abstracts too long and detailed, and the current abstract already implies these specifics by listing the minerals. 2. Given that 2023 was the International Year of Millets, a very brief mention of this global initiative in the context of their resurgence or strategic integration could add a contemporary and policy-relevant touch, especially if the target audience is strongly policy-oriented. For example, after discussing "Strategic integration of millets into public nutrition programs...", one could add "a focus amplified by global initiatives such as the International Year of Millets."   I do not suggest the deletion of any points. Every sentence in the abstract serves a clear purpose and contributes to its comprehensiveness |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.** | Based on the provided text, the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct and well-supported.   1. The manuscript consistently makes claims about nutritional composition, health benefits, and processing impacts, and crucially, it cites specific studies or reputable organizations (e.g., FAO, Eiden et.al., Pokharia et.al., Saleh et.al., etc.). While I don't have access to the full reference list or the ability to verify each citation, the presence of these citations indicates that the authors are grounding their statements in scientific literature. 2. The information presented across different sections (e.g., nutrient values, GI ranges, health benefits) is consistent. For example, the high calcium content of finger millet and the low GI of millets are reiterated and supported throughout. 3. The manuscript acknowledges complexities, such as antinutritional factors (phytic acid, tannins) and how processing can mitigate them. This shows a balanced and accurate scientific perspective rather than an overly simplistic one. It also mentions challenges in consumer acceptance and processing, which are real-world considerations. 4. The use of terms like "macronutrient profile," "micronutrient richness," "phytochemicals," "glycemic index," "antioxidant activity," "immunomodulatory," "nutraceuticals," "biofortification," and "nutrigenomics" is appropriate and indicates a good grasp of the scientific field. 5. The botanical classification, geographical distribution, and agroecological adaptability described for millets align with general scientific knowledge about these crops. 6. The botanical classification, geographical distribution, and agroecological adaptability described for millets align with general scientific knowledge about these crops. 7. For health benefits, the manuscript often goes beyond just stating the benefit and provides some explanation of the underlying mechanisms (e.g., how fiber affects satiety, how polyphenols act as antioxidants, how magnesium affects blood pressure).   Minor corrections- The numerical values cited (e.g., calcium in finger millet, protein percentages, GI ranges) are not cited by specific references. |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | References are sufficient and recent, and also, other relevant references are cited. Cite some references for meta- analysis for glycemic control, and some clinical trials are mentioned (e.g., HbA1c reduction), if there are more recent or larger-scale human intervention studies |  |
| **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?** | Yes, the language and English quality of the article are highly suitable for scholarly |  |
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