

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_126010
Title of the Manuscript:	FORMULATION AND QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF NUTRITIONALLY RICH PIZZA BASE
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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>
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.	The article explores the use of other grains such as Kodo millet, buckwheat flour, and brown rice in the production of Pizza base which is important with regards to nutrition, variety and promotion of less utilized resources.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title may be modified to "Proximate analysis of multi-grain Pizza base"	
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.	Standardization and sensory analysis stated in the abstract are not captured in the methodology nor result sections	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The methodology needs to be updated and more comprehensive	
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.	The article seems to be sliced out of a more comprehensive research, hence important methods and results are missing. How did the authors arrive at the percentages used for ingredient formulation? What is the justification? The standardisation process is not explained. Methods of analyses not well explained- what solvent was used for Soxhlet extraction? Results of only 2 samples presented of four stated in methods. No discussion of results in view of the existing literature.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Reference list contains recent literature. However, references are not listed consecutively as cited within text, instead listed alphabetically.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The authors are advised to grammar-check the manuscript.	
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:	Abdussalaam Rukayat O
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Agriculture Abeokuta, Nigeria