

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_122398
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimizing the Process Parameters for Carrot Pulp Cake Development Using Response Surface Methodology
Type of the Article	Original Research 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 manuscript is pertinent to the fields of food science technology and nutrition. However, its quality could be significantly enhanced if the authors had also examined the nutritional benefits of the products, alongside the acceptability test.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable for the content of the manuscript.	
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. However, the authors should include the number of cake samples produced. Additionally, the statement "The findings contribute to the development of healthier and more sustainable bakery products" should be deleted, as there is no justification provided. The authors did not assess the health benefits of the products.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections of the manuscript are appropriate and logically structured.	
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 is scientific, technically sound. The authors only investigated the physical and sensory properties of the new cake products, and did not consider the nutritional property/ benefit of the cake samples.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references provided are adequate for the study; however, over 50% of them are outdated. The authors should update these references with more recent sources.	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is suitable for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I commend the authors for exploring diverse cake production methods using available food materials to reduce dependence on wheat flour. However, I have the following suggestions to improve the manuscript:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The authors did not clearly articulate the knowledge gap in the research area and how the present research addresses this gap. The study aims were also not clearly stated. I suggest revising the introduction section to address these issues. 2. If possible, determine the proximate composition of at least five of the most acceptable cake samples. If this is not feasible, suggest a comprehensive analysis of the nutritional and health benefits of the cake samples as future research to fully ascertain the benefits of the new products. 3. The tables are too numerous. Consider merging tables with similar headings and using subheadings to distinguish the samples. For instance, merge all the ANOVA tables and segment them based on parameters (specific volume, springiness, and overall acceptability). Apply the same approach to tables on fit statistics data. 4. The conclusion did not clearly summarize the research outcomes. It should highlight the study's implications, drawn from the findings and discussion. I suggest revising the conclusion to reflect this. 	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Agugo, Udodiri Agatha</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Ambrose Alli University Ekpoma, Nigeria</p>