

Review Form 3

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety  |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_EJNFS_131114  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Sensory Evaluation of Rasmalai blended with Sweet potato (Ipomoea batatas L.) pulp |
| Type of the Article      | Original Research Article  |

PART 1: Comments

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
|   | <b>Reviewer’s comment</b><br>Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.   | <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)   |
| Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | <div>✓ This Study explores the novel incorporation of sweet potato pulp into Rasmalai, a popular dairy-based dessert. By evaluating the sensory attributes, it provides insights into improving the nutritional profile, texture, and overall acceptability of traditional sweets.</div> <div>✓ Additionally, this work contributes to the growing body of research on functional foods, sustainability, and value addition in dairy products, offering potential benefits for the food industry and public health.</div> | yes   |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)  | <div>✓ Good Title and Suitable, as It prepare an alternate, Food product for community with Improved Nutritional content.</div>   | 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.     | <div>✓ Good with some Improvements regarding, Result and discussion. The Author should Incorporate Data analysis and statistical analysis final result data in abstract part of the paper.</div>  | As per suggestion data added in abstract part of paper  |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.   | <div>✓ The study focuses on sensory evaluation but does not provide nutritional data (e.g., carbohydrate, protein, fiber content).</div> <div>✓ Including a proximate analysis would strengthen the study by quantifying the nutritional benefits of adding sweet potato pulp.</div>  | Aim of this study to finalised sweet potato pulp for Rasogolla part of Rasmalai for this reason carried out only sensory evaluation. But in future I will remember to carried out chemical/ nutritional analysis. Please Considered at this time. |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.                             | <div>✓ Some references are outdated, example: 2007, 2013. Author need to revise and amend with recent references.</div>   | As per suggestion some outdated references removed from manuscript and addsome recent references.   |

Review Form 3

|   |   |                       |
|---|---|-----------------------|
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | <div>✓ There are numerous grammatical errors and awkward phrasing. The article would benefit from professional proofreading.</div> <div>Example: "Nutritional benefits of sweet potato bladed in Rasmalai were exploited in the present study..." → should be "The nutritional benefits of sweet potato blended into Rasmalai were explored in this study..." The author duty is to revise and amend those grammar and related punctuation.</div>   | Corrected             |
| Optional/General comments   | <div>✓ The Paper Introduction part/Methodology part need minimum of a single image describing that Raw Material or Blending Products.</div> <div>✓ While sensory scores suggest consumer acceptance, a discussion on potential marketability would add value.</div> <div>✓ Would consumers be willing to pay extra for this enhanced Rasmalai?</div> <div>✓ <b>Figures &amp; Tables Formatting Issues:</b><div><div>○ The flowchart for sweet potato pulp preparation is informative but could be more visually clear. As Author Improve such a way.</div><div>○ Tables could be formatted more neatly and modern way for better readability.</div></div></div> <div>✓ <b>Why 10% sweet potato pulp the optimal level?</b> to balance between sweetness, texture, or some other factors?<div><div>○ Did you consider running a proximate analysis to quantify fiber, vitamins, or antioxidant content?</div><div>○ Since sweet potato adds natural sweetness, could sugar levels be further reduced without affecting acceptability?</div></div></div> <div>✓ <b>Were consumer trials conducted beyond the laboratory section?</b><div><div>○ Testing with a broader audience (e.g., different age groups) would provide better insights into commercial viability.</div></div></div> | Corrected as possible |

PART 2:

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