

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_97653
Title of the Manuscript:	Physio-chemical properties and oxidative stability of microencapsulated silkworm pupae oil enriched mayonnaise
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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>	This manuscript evaluates the stability of mayonnaise prepared using silkworm pupae. While this is an interesting study, I don't think it is of great scientific importance. The authors mention consuming insects is a tradition followed by several tribal communities. But this study implicates the use of pupae in mayonnaise, which is not an item consumed by majority of tribal communities. The substitution of pupal oil is of no merit to the people who don't consume it. Yes, the title is representative of the content in the manuscript. Yes, the abstract is comprehensive. Yes, the subsections are fine, but there is no indication of tables or figures in the text. (if some data discussed in the text is represented as a table, the table needs to be referenced in the text). The scientific analysis of the paper is sound. The references are too few and not recent. It seems like the author had based their study on only one or 2 papers. More recent research has to be included. The manuscript needs a better discussion section. Why are they evaluating the stability of mayonnaise? It is not commonly consumed by majority of Indian communities, let alone tribal communities. The statistical methods used in the manuscript have to be explained in more detail. The authors have misspelled "Tukey's post hoc test". Please correct it.	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language needs no further modification.	
<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>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shilpa Sonti
Department, University & Country	Children's Hospital of Philadelphia, USA