

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JGEESI_95314</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Diacetyl - A Critical Safety Review of Twenty Years of Science Defining the Flavoring's Inhalation Hazards Association with Chronic Irreversible Lung Disease</b>
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.journalgeesi.com/index.php/JGEESI/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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. <b>Yes the article is definitely of importance for scientific community.This study would help in making policies by stakeholders for use of diacetyl flavouring agents.</b> 2. <b>I am not sure what type of article is this one.It appears to be a systematic review to me.Hence the title may be modified. Second point is regarding 'twenty years'.The author has included studies from 1960s so why 'twenty years' written in the title?</b> 3. <b>My suggestion is that the abstract must be a continuous text rather than writing in points.</b> 4. <b>Yes appropriate.</b> 5. <b>Yes,correct.</b> 6. <b>There are too many references.Few may be deleted.</b>	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	It can be improved.In present state too much to read .	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Suyog Sindhu</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>KGMU, India</b>