

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_92308
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of charcoal preservation methods on the biochemical parameters of three plantain (<i>Musa ssp</i>) varieties
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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> This is Research Article not review article. Abstract: In result part 4th line. During storage, there is an increase in contains of total carbohydrates (1.290% and 2.666%)????? Not clarify. Material and Methods: Researcher has not clarified regarding sampling days. In control condition the analysis period was recorded up to 12 days. It should justified. In the treatment Batch 4: plantain samples preserved in packages with humidified charcoal powder What was the moisture content of charcoal powder? In some places author has use the word wet charcoal powder. It should be justify. Results : In the Tables the data should be keeping up to two decimals. Total soluble sugars data presented on dry weight basis. While the total carbohydrates and starch content data was presented on the fresh weight basis. Please check the data. If it is on dry weight basis, then the moisture content data should be keep in the paper. It may give more clarity. Discussion part is very poor. The mechanism of action of charcoal should be given. Conclusion: Without statistical analysis one cannot say that the result is significant or non significant. It may specify for any one treatment, which can enhance the biochemical characters during the storage. References: Reference No. 14, Year ? References are very old. Researcher/Author should add some recent references for more clarity 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jitendra J Dhruv
Department, University & Country	Anand Agricultural University, India