

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_98184
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of the biochemical, physicochemical and microbiological quality of soft drinks sold in some elementary school of williamsville (Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire)
Type of the 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.journalejnf.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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. The manuscript has definitely its local importance, acknowledging the public health institutions about issues regarding child health. 2. Yes 3. Yes, respecting the general scheme of an abstract 4. Yes 5. Yes, although the number of samples tested is way too small for having statistical significance 6. Yes, the study is documented and relies mostly on published standards for determination methods	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes. Some changes (switch from the present tense to the past tense, mostly) have been suggested.	
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:	Alexandra-Maria Născuțiu
Department, University & Country	"Carol Davila" University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Romania