

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.	The topic is highly relevant due to emerging search for alternate sugar source crops with lower carbon footprint. Sugarcane options, the highly irrigated and high fertilizer input crop, are in demand and pearl millet leads in it. Its environmental footprint is lower as its mainly dryland, unirrigated crop, and poverty alleviation tool.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title may add the word 'eco-friendly' or "low-carbon" before "sugar syrup production".	
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.	A line may be added on the 'eco-friendly'/"low carbon footprint" nature of the crop & poverty alleviation/ farmer income raising crop in dryland/ rainfed regions globally.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Please add likely price of "sugar syrup" from pearl millet with Sugarcane or Corn- the main source crops today. Is Benefit-cost ratio better than sugarcane and/ or Corn? Further, is PM sugar syrup more healthy/ less obesity prone than HFCS- high fructose corn syrup widely used industrially such as in soft drinks/ bakery?	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- Please add- The topic is highly relevant due to emerging search for alternate sugar source crops with lower carbon footprint. Sugarcane – after "lower cost compared to cereals such as rice or corn" 2- Carbon sequestration/ net zero- https://indianforester.co.in/index.php/indianforester/article/view/168882 3- Please add- "it's 'C4 type' photosynthetic crop- known for higher productivity" there after on page 1/2. 4- Please specify its 'eco-friendly" after saying it has less 'carbon footprint" as its grown with "less fertilizer and pesticide" inputs than cash crops like Sugarcane on page 1 after "subsistence farmers across the continents" on page 2. Add ref.- https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8475763/ 5- Add ref. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2590259822000395 on page 1 when you say its "gluten-free" food and also https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s44187-024-00149-w. 6- Please add ref. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11091339/ to say its "nutri-rich". 7- Please add ref. for processing techniques review- https://www.researchgate.net/publication/322278079_Pearl_millet_processing_a_review 8- Please add a table/ 3-4 lines on benefit cost ratio/ profit of PM vs. Sugarcane/ Corn- both "thirsty" crops. 	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, English is suitable.	
Optional/General comments	It's a good article but needs to highlight environmental and health benefits besides economic viability.	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<u>Name:</u>	Utkarsh Ghatе
<u>Department, University & Country</u>	RANWA, India