

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	RESEARCH PAPER

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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is valuable for the scientific community as it explores an innovative approach to enhancing the nutritional value of a popular food product, pizza. By incorporating millet and other grains into the pizza base, it offers a healthier alternative to conventional refined flour bases, addressing concerns related to diabetes, heart disease, and general nutritional inadequacy. I like the manuscript because it focuses on a timely topic, leveraging traditional grains to create a modern, health-conscious food option, which can appeal to both scientific researchers and consumers.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, "Formulation and Quality Assessment of Nutritionally Rich Pizza Base," is generally appropriate. However, to make it more specific and appealing, an alternative title could be: "Development and Nutritional Evaluation of Millet-Based Pizza Base for Health-Conscious Consumers."	
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 abstract is comprehensive and summarizes the key points of the study, such as the nutritional composition and sensory evaluation. However, I suggest adding information about the specific grains used and their respective nutritional contributions. Additionally, highlighting the broader implications for public health and potential market impact would strengthen the abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript's structure and subsections are appropriate and logically organized. Each section flows well from one to the next, covering the formulation process, nutritional analysis, and sensory evaluation clearly.	
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 manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound. The methodology, including the AOAC methods for nutritional analysis, is appropriate, and the results are supported by data that demonstrate the nutritional improvements in the developed pizza base. The discussion and conclusions drawn are consistent with the data presented, reinforcing the reliability of the research.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and generally recent, with relevant studies cited to support the nutritional and health claims regarding millet and pizza base formulation. However, it could benefit from additional references related to recent innovations in functional foods and pizza base development, especially post-2022 research.	
Minor REVISION comments	The language is generally suitable for scholarly communication, though some minor grammatical adjustments and refinements in phrasing could improve clarity.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include more details in the abstract about the individual contributions of each type of grain to the overall nutritional profile. • Clarify the sensory evaluation process, such as how the panelists were selected and the criteria used for scoring. • Check for consistency in the use of scientific terms (e.g., Kodo millet vs. kodo millet). <p>, I would suggest a minor revision score: 8.5. The manuscript has potential but would benefit from clearer data presentation, a more detailed methodology section, and thorough proofreading to address minor grammatical errors.</p>	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Gayathri Sanyasi
Department, University & Country	Andhra University, India