

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_129206
Title of the Manuscript:	“Exploring the Potential of Pearl Millet for Sugar Syrup Production”
Type of the Article	Review 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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The article underscores the potential of millet as a viable solution to pressing global challenges, including the expanding world population and the urgent need for sustainable agricultural practices. It presents critical data on global millet production, providing a comprehensive analysis of its global context. - The study explores a relatively under-researched area: the utilization of pearl millet as a source for syrup production. - Acknowledging certain limitations in millet cultivation for industrial-scale applications, the article justifies the necessity of adopting techniques to enhance its properties and performance. - Moreover, the study offers detailed technical insights into glucose production from pearl millet, examining key factors such as gelatinization, yield, and syrup viscosity, thereby contributing significant scientific depth to the research. 	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	<p>The summary is unclear. Avoid excessive details, such as "... has not yet been widely explored", and rather describe the potential or significant advances that the review proposes. Highlight what makes the article unique, asking the following questions: "What are the novel techniques proposed? What are the main modifications in the properties or characteristics of the syrup by process used?" The answers to these questions could help consolidate the abstract.</p> <p>Use keywords that allow better communication with the scientific community, for example: Pearl millet, starch modification, sugar syrup, sustainable food production, value-added products.</p>	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, however, the text lacks greater depth and organization.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes. Verify the citation style in some references. Example: 11, 12, 38, etc.	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>I suggest revising some paragraphs in English, prioritizing passive voice writing.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Insert space (page 1): ... and Ethiopia [3]. - In the introduction, in the first paragraph, it mentions that there are studies that indicate that millet production has a lower carbon footprint compared to other cereals, however, it only places a reference. - I suggest reflecting the carbon footprint comparison in values and specifying which are those “other cereals”. In that way we highlight a relevant factor for sustainability. - The introduction shows relevant information on the nutritional and health-positive aspect of pearl millet, and gives a historical perspective, however, the purpose of the study is not clearly defined. The introduction could be completed, for example: “This article aims to explore the utilization of pearl millet for the production of starch-derived syrups, with emphasis on processing technologies and limitations. - I suggest placing text that shows a better linkage between the components of pearl millet and its specific application for the production of syrups. - The introduction is dense, I suggest to better order and structure the topics that are touched, since they mention health, history, production, limitations. For example, start with the history of millet, production, nutrients, etc., in this way a clearer transition would be shown and a more readable idea would be provided. - On p. 5, section 3.0 needs more technical details. The authors point out the use of some physical, chemical and enzymatic techniques for their application, however, they do not provide concrete evidence to support these claims. In this section we place the impact of these technical modifications on the production of sugar syrup. For example: “Enzymatic hydrolysis improves the extraction of simple sugars, which is crucial for the production of high-quality syrup”. - I suggest changing the subtitle to: Transforming techniques for the development of pearl millet sugar syrups “. One could cite studies concerning the parameters of pearl millet starch extraction and the technologies used. <p>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meafao.2024.100188</p> <p>https://doi.org/10.1002/jsfa.13129</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the body of the text change 3.2 to 3.1 and vice versa, i.e. first explain the germination process and then put information on malt and how it influences the germination process. - In section 3.4, although clear results are presented, their application on an industrial scale should be discussed. Although differences in DE and total solids content between PM, corn and sorghum are mentioned, the authors do not explain why these differences are relevant from an industrial or nutritional point of view. To deepen the use of enzymes. - The conclusion mentions “lack of investment” but does not propose specific approaches to attract commercial interest in millet. In addition, terms such as food security and malnutrition problems are mentioned, but the body of the text does not elaborate on these topics. 	

PART 2:

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

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jhoseline Stayce Guillen Sanchez
Department, University & Country	Cesar Vallejo University, Peru