

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_130034
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Whey Protein Concentrate and Little Millet on the sensory attributes of Low-fat Greek yoghurt spread
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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- The article is fair, it needs more analysis to make. 2- Authors made just sensory attributes for the final product and this is not enough. 3- Authors need to make language check carefully. 4- 	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No, it is not suitable, because authors not mentioned Little Millet flour.	
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The abstract is too long, there are many sentences must be deleted. • Is it need for classify the abstract; if it's necessary it must be rewired. • Authors mentioned at the aim that they assessed the impact of these additives on rheological characteristics but they did not do this parameter. • Better to begin with two sentences of background of the important of this research point. • There is no need for mentioning the place & time and methodology of the study at the abstract. • Authors mentioned that they pasteurized the milk but they did not mention the time pasteurization. • When the heat over 90 °C they better said it is heated not pasteurized. • Results and conclusion must summarize more than that. • It would be better to choose some important results not all and also a few sentences for conclusion. 	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript needs more attention due to its fair language and little analysis.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references need to more update till 2025.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English language is fair need to more improved.	
Optional/General comments	The first table gave the title (list 1) not table. Figure (2) is not the same of its title.	

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:	Jihan Mohamed Kassem
Department, University & Country	National Research Centre, Egypt