

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_123135
Title of the Manuscript:	Utilization of hibiscus, tamarind and carob in production of low calories healthy soft drinks
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>I would like to begin by acknowledging the authors for their thoughtful and valuable contribution to the field of functional beverages.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unlike many previous studies that focus on conventional soft drink ingredients, this research explores hibiscus, tamarind, and carob—locally available and underutilized ingredients with significant nutritional benefits. • The manuscript provides a detailed comparison of erythritol concentrations in these beverages, offering new insights into its effectiveness as a low-calorie sweetener, which has been less explored in the context of these specific ingredients. 	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes. It is suitable.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The content is comprehensive, but it lacks proper structure. The methods section of the abstract is too brief, and the results section contains unnecessary information and mixed content.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The discussion section is unclear, while the introduction and conclusion are unnecessarily long.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It employs a well-detailed and methodologically sound approach, including the preparation of beverages, chemical analysis, and sensory evaluation. 2. The methods described, such as the preparation of the extracts and the analytical techniques used, are clearly outlined, allowing for reproducibility of the study by other researchers. 3. The findings contribute meaningful insights into the development of healthier soft drinks, highlighting the nutritional benefits of hibiscus, tamarind, and carob, which are not only scientifically accurate but also applicable to real-world consumer needs. 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Yes, the references are sufficient. While a few are from before 2010, the majority are more recent and relevant.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No, the manuscript needs a major revision in terms of English language to meet the standards for scholarly communication. There are issues with grammar, sentence structure, and clarity throughout the text.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sara Khoshdooz Masouleh
Department, University & Country	Guilan University of Medical Science, Iran