

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(If agreed with the reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. Authors must write his/her feedback here)</i>
Is the manuscript important for the scientific community? Please write a few sentences explaining your answer	Yes. The manuscript addresses an understudied yet clinically relevant neonatal behaviour—the “milk coma”—and explains its neuroendocrine basis comprehensively. This topic is valuable for nurses, lactation consultants, and maternal–child health professionals because it enhances understanding of infant physiology, supports breastfeeding counselling, and strengthens evidence-based maternal education. The integration of hormonal, neurological, and clinical perspectives makes it meaningful for the scientific and clinical nursing community.	
Is the title of the article suitable? Do you have any alternative Title in your mind?	The title is appealing, reader-friendly, and accurately reflects the content. Optional Alternative Titles: • “Neuroendocrine Mechanisms of Post-Feed Sleepiness in Infants” • “Understanding the Physiology Behind Infant Milk Coma”	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	Yes, the abstract is comprehensive and clearly outlines the phenomenon, underlying physiology, and nursing implications. One suggestion is to shorten it slightly for conciseness and add a concluding line summarising practical significance.	
Do you think the English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	Overall, the English is clear, coherent, and professional. A few sentences could be shortened or simplified to improve flow. Minor grammatical edits and standardization of tense may enhance readability but no major revision is required.	

Please provide your comments regarding the appropriateness of different sections of the manuscript.	Introduction: Strong, contextually relevant, and establishes clinical significance. Aim & Scope: Clearly stated and aligned with the content. Main Body (Physiology and Hormonal Mechanisms): Excellent depth, well-structured, scientifically grounded. Nursing Implications: Highly relevant and practical; strengthens applicability in maternal–child care. Conclusion: Concise and aligned with the aim. Flow & Organisation: Logical progression and good coherence throughout. Overall, sections are appropriate, well-developed, and adequately referenced.	
Do you think that the references in the manuscript are proper, recent and sufficient? If you have any suggestions, please write here.	Yes. References include several recent studies (2021–2024), authoritative lactation textbooks, and credible physiological research. They adequately support the manuscript. Suggestion: Add 1–2 more citations specifically on CCK and infant satiety for completeness.	

PART 1: Article Title: PARENTING ARTICLE - “THE ADORABLE MILK COMA: THE SCIENCE BEHIND POST-FEED SLEEP IN INFANTS”

PART 2:

	Reviewer’s comment	
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	No ethical concerns. The article is a narrative review and does not involve human	

	subjects or primary data collection.	
Are there competing interest issues in this manuscript?	None noted.	
Do you think the article is plagiarized? If yes, please justify your answer and send us some proof.	No evidence of plagiarism. The writing appears original, well-synthesized, and appropriately referenced.	
Do you think a Disclaimer is required to explain the history of this manuscript? (As in most cases chapters of reference books are extended versions of previously published articles in some journals)	A disclaimer is not necessary. The content appears to be original and not derived from previously published chapters.	

PART 3: Declaration of Competing Interest of the Reviewer:

Here reviewer should declare his/her competing interest. If nothing to declare he/she can write “I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer”

PART 4: Objective Evaluation:

Guideline	MARKS of this manuscript
Give OVERALL MARKS you want to give to this manuscript (Highest: 10 Lowest: 0) Guideline: Accept As It Is: (>9-10) Minor Revision: (>8-9) Major Revision: (>7-8) Serious Major revision: (>5-7) Rejected (with repairable deficiencies and may be reconsidered): (>3-5) Strongly rejected (with irreparable deficiencies.): (>0-3)	9 / 10 Justification: Scientifically sound, clinically relevant, and well-written. Strong neuroendocrine explanation and high-quality nursing implications section. Only minor language tightening and small additions to references are recommended.

Specific Comments:

Consider reducing repetition in the hormone descriptions to improve conciseness.

Add visual diagrams or flowcharts in future versions to enhance understanding of hormonal pathways.

A short section comparing physiological sleepiness vs pathological lethargy would further strengthen clinical utility.