

	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.	Thank you. I appreciate the reviewer's recognition of the clinical relevance of this topic, particularly its value for maternal-child health professionals and lactation consultants.
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”	Agreed. I have reviewed the title suggestions. To balance reader engagement with scientific accuracy, I have refined the title to: “Understanding the Physiology Behind Infant Milk Coma” . This incorporates the "science/physiology" aspect suggested by the reviewer while maintaining the engaging "milk coma" terminology commonly used by parents.
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 summarizing practical significance.	Agreed and Revised. I have edited the abstract for conciseness. As requested, I added a specific concluding sentence summarizing the practical significance for nurses: "Nurses play a vital role in recognizing this state as a positive indicator of effective feeding, supporting mother–infant bonding, and educating families...".

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.	Agreed. I have carefully reviewed the manuscript to standardize tenses and improve sentence flow. Minor grammatical edits have been applied throughout to ensure the language is professional and suitable for scholarly communication.
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.	Thank you. I am sincerely grateful for the reviewer’s detailed and encouraging assessment of the manuscript’s structure. I am pleased that the flow, organization, and depth of the Introduction, Main Body, and Nursing Implications were found to be strong and clinically relevant.
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.	Agreed and added. I have updated the reference list to include recent studies relevant to satiety hormones. For example, I added Liang, H., et al. (2024) regarding role of CCK <i>in feeding regulation</i>, and Holliday, A., et al. (2025) regarding Appetite-related gut hormone responses to feeding.

PART 1: Article Title: "UNDERSTANDING THE PHYSIOLOGY BEHIND INFANT MILK COMA"

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.	Agreed. Thank you. I confirm that this manuscript is a narrative review summarizing existing literature and did not involve any human participants or primary data collection requiring ethical clearance.
Are there competing interest issues in this manuscript?	None noted.	Agreed. I declare that I have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.
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.	Thank you. I appreciate the reviewer's acknowledgment of the manuscript's originality and the care taken to synthesize and reference the sources correctly.
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.	Agreed. I confirm that this is an original work and has not been submitted or published elsewhere, in whole or in part, including as a book chapter

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) <u>Guideline:</u> 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.