

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_95569
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF POST-MORTEM PROCESSING METHODS ON QUALITY AND SHELF LIFE OF MUTTON
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.journalejnfs.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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Manuscript may be important for some of the researcher/students doing work in the fields of meat processing, sheep breed comparison in the local region. It will be more useful for meat processors in the region where the work was carried out. 2. Not suitable. It should be "Assessment of meat processing techniques in two breeds of sheep". 3. Abstract is comprehensive for the research paper but suitable as per conclusion and recommendation provided by the authors. 4. There is lack of numbering in the section and sub-sections. 5. It is scientifically correct. 6. References are sufficient for the data provided in the paper but authors have forgot to mention all the references in the reference sections (15 missing). <p>The topic taken was a general for mutton but authors have compared only two breeds of sheep and only three methods of processing. Additional reference given but not discussed in text:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Zhang, J.J., Xu, D.P, Li, Y., Meng, X., Zhou, T. and Li, H. (2017) Natural antioxidants in foods and medicinal plants; Extraction, assessment and resources. <i>International Journal Mol Science</i>, 18: 96 2. Hollis, F., Kaplow, M., Klose, R. and Halik, J. (1968). Tech. Report 69-20 – FL, US Army Natrick Labs, Mass., USA. 	<p>A. Conclusion and abstract are not concurrent.</p> <p>B. Following are missing references:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Apata 2014 2. AOAC 2000 3. Taiwo <i>et al.</i>, 2017 4. Allen, 1990 5. Alflaia <i>et al.</i>, 2010 6. Apata and Toluwase, 2015 7. Ikene, 1990 8. Akinleye <i>et al.</i>, (2019) 9. Mahgoub <i>et al.</i>, (2005) 10. Akwetey <i>et al.</i>, (2013) 11. Ijeoma <i>et al.</i>, (2015) 12. Fawole and Oso, 2001 13. Grunert <i>et al.</i>, 2004) 14. Vasilev <i>et al.</i>, 2017 15. Fasae <i>et al.</i>, 2010) 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>English quality of the article in NOT SUITABLE for the scholarly communications. There are lots of spelling mistakes, grammatical mistakes and several places need sentence corrections.</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Study needs revision in terms of process adopted in the research work. The manuscript have to be thoroughly re-written as English grammar, sentences corrections and many spelling mistakes and a few symbol mistakes are there.</p>		

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 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Manish Kumar Maurya
Department, University & Country	Tamil Nadu Veterinary and Animal Sciences University, India