

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_91188
Title of the Manuscript:	A recent Review on the Effects of Calcium carbide Used as a Fruit-ripening Agent
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://www.journalejns.com/index.php/EJNFS/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ The article is well written that provides an (all-in-one) summary of the most important findings showing the nutritional values of calcium carbide-treated fruits are lower than those estimated in naturally ripe fruits. ❖ Both additions and corrections were outlined in red color. ❖ Many of the words outlined in yellow should be deleted. ❖ Please include the full name before the abbreviations in the abstract. ❖ Please re-arrange the keywords alphabetically. ❖ Numbers 1-9 are written in the form of words, and numbers greater than 10 are written in the form of numbers. ❖ It is preferable to rewrite the first paragraph of the conclusion for more clarity. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Adding line numbers may be useful for reviewing. ❖ Grammar: Need Some revision. 	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ In general, the paper is well written, and the manuscript is relevant and informative. ❖ Title: the title properly explains the purpose and objective of the article ❖ Abstract: The abstract offers an accurate summary of the paper, and the language used in the abstract is easy to read and understand. ❖ Introduction: The authors provide sufficient context on the subject. ❖ Conclusion: The research offers sample data for the authors to draw conclusions from. 	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Manal Hadi Ghaffoori Kanaan
Department, University & Country	Middle Technical University, Iraq