

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>European Journal of Nutrition &amp; Food Safety</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_EJNFS_123276</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of Incorporation of Carrot flour on Quality Characteristics of Cake</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The manuscript provides valuable insights into the potential of incorporating carrot flour into cake formulations, which could enhance the nutritional profile and sensory attributes of the product. By exploring the impact on key quality characteristics like texture, flavor, and shelf-life, the study contributes to the development of healthier bakery products. This research is particularly relevant in the context of increasing consumer demand for functional foods and could serve as a reference for food scientists and the bakery industry. The findings could also pave the way for further studies on the use of vegetable flours in other baked goods.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>The title "Effect of Incorporation of Carrot Flour on Quality Characteristics of Cake" is clear and descriptive, effectively conveying the focus of the study. It highlights both the independent variable (carrot flour) and the dependent variables (quality characteristics of cake), making it easy for readers to understand the scope of the research. However, if you want to make it more specific or engaging, you could consider specifying the type of quality characteristics examined (e.g., texture, flavor, nutritional value) or emphasizing the health aspect (e.g., "Nutritional and Quality Impacts"). But overall, the current title is suitable for the manuscript.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The first sentence could be more specific in linking the general benefits of cake to the study's focus on incorporating carrot flour. For example: "Cake, a popular baked good typically high in fats, carbohydrates, and protein, can be enriched with additional nutrients by incorporating vegetable flours, such as carrot flour. The description of the treatment groups (T1, T2, etc.) is a bit confusing due to repetition and lack of clarity on the flour blends. Simplifying this part could make it clearer. The results section is well-structured but could benefit from explicitly stating the significance of the findings, particularly the sensory evaluation. For example: "The sensory evaluation revealed that the 80:20 ratio of RWF to CF (T3) produced the most favorable results, with the highest scores for color, texture, taste, and flavor. Although the abstract touches on the results, it would be useful to include a brief concluding statement about the overall implications of the findings. For example: "These findings suggest that incorporating carrot flour at a specific ratio can enhance the sensory qualities of cake while maintaining safe storage conditions</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript appear to be appropriate for a scientific study, as they likely follow a logical progression from introduction to methodology, results, and discussion. This typical structure allows for a clear presentation of the research process and findings, facilitating reader comprehension.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound, as it employs a systematic approach to evaluate the effects of incorporating carrot flour into cake formulations. The study's design, including the use of multiple treatment groups with varying proportions of carrot flour and controlled storage conditions, allows for a thorough investigation of the impact on both nutritional and sensory qualities. Additionally, the use of standard methodologies for assessing phosphorus, iron content, microbial counts, and sensory attributes ensures that the findings are reliable and reproducible. The clear presentation of results, particularly the statistical significance of the sensory evaluations, further supports the scientific validity of the study's conclusions.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> =</p>	<p>The references cited in the manuscript are both sufficient and recent, encompassing key studies that support the research on incorporating carrot flour into cake formulations. The inclusion of contemporary sources from the past five years underscores the manuscript's relevance and alignment with current scientific advancements in food science and nutrition. However, it might be beneficial to include additional references on recent advancements in the use of vegetable flours in bakery products to further strengthen the literature review.</p>	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication, as the content is clearly articulated, and the scientific terminology is used appropriately. The manuscript effectively conveys the research objectives, methods, and findings in a manner that is understandable to the academic audience. However, there are a few areas where minor grammatical adjustments and rephrasing could enhance readability and flow. Overall, the language quality meets the standards for scholarly communication, but a final proofreading could ensure even greater clarity and precision.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The study appears to be scientifically rigorous, with a well-defined experimental design and appropriate methods for assessing the quality characteristics of the cakes. The use of sensory evaluation, along with nutritional and microbial analysis, provides a comprehensive assessment of the carrot-blended cakes.	

### **PART 2:**

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

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Vipul Chaudhary</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Acharya Narendra Deva University of Agriculture and Technology, India</b>