

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 | <p>1) In ch. 3 important abbreviations appear that are explained after the first appearance a few pages later, after the tables. I suggested moving the explanatory passages to the first appearance.</p> <p>2) please check the correct way of using the word rate and content, rate being a speed of variation in physical terms (I explained in the reviewed manuscript).</p> <p>3) For the source [14] in the reference list, I did not find the citation in the text.</p> <p>4) A rigorous control of the language and the English language is recommended. The control with the Word editor must be performed in the version of the English language in which the article will be published (UK, USA or India). After checking with the English word editor, a check with the Grammarly program, the free version, for example, is recommended.</p> <p>5) The conclusions could try to predict the minimum preservation time in safe conditions by categories of packaging.</p> | |
| Minor REVISION comments | | |
| Optional/General comments | <p>The work is of good quality and can be published. However, there are possibilities for improvement to make it more attractive, easier to understand and present (especially the discussions and conclusions). In order to improve, we suggest: 1) GIS identification of the collection location of the studied plant samples and introduction of a map in the text. This data storage can become the premise of a database in the culture of the respective plants in the territory of the region or the country; photos of the plantations from which the fruits were harvested can also be inserted; 2) The use of graphical representations (linear and nonlinear regressions) in the evolution of the content of various substances (starch, carbohydrates, sugar, proteins), based on which graphical representations can also be deduced for the rate of decrease of the contents in these substances (see, for example, the paper: "Siti Amirah , M. Z., Nor Afifah, A. R*, Husni Hayati, M.R., and Wan Zaliha, W.S., THE EFFECTS OF CHARCOAL FROM DIFFERENT AGRICULTURAL WASTES IN REDUCING ETHYLENE PRODUCTION OF BERANGAN BANANA (<i>Musa sp.</i> AAA Berangan), Proceedings of The International Conference of FoSSA Jember, August 1st - 3rd, 2017)</p> <p>Important observation</p> <p>The review form from the Publishing House describes the type of article as a Review Article. This article does not meet the conditions of a Review Paper, according to the authors' guide: -contains the description of some own experiences; - it has only 32 references (more than 50 are needed for the review paper); - does not contain figures. I corrected the article as an Original Research Paper. Please let me know if there is a mistake in the initial form that declares the work as a Review Article.</p> <p>The article exceeds the number of words allowed by the publishing house for an Original Research Paper type article, it has 7236 words (the publishing house limits it to 6000). The type of articles must be renegotiated between authors and editors.</p> | |

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | Petru Cardei |
| Department, University & Country | The National Institute of Research, Bucharest |