

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEAI_98960</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>THE RISE OF NANOTECHNOLOGY - FOOD PROCESSING AND PACKAGING</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.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/editorial-policy> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I am sorry to write this, but I do not think so, the arguments are given below.</li> <li>The title is all right.</li> <li>Yes, the abstract is comprehensive.</li> <li>I do not see any problems with the structure.</li> <li>I have not found scientific errors.</li> <li>I would recommend using more recent references (see comments below).</li> </ol> <p>The era of nano-everything (with full respect to nanoscience, I am working in this area too) is still running. Only <b>since</b> 2023 (!) google scholar has just shown me 2,960 scientific articles with all the four following key words: "nanotechnology, food processing, packaging", among which 1,450 (!!)</p> <p>are the review articles. And here are two first problems with the manuscript:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) the freshest reference in the given article is from 2018 (actually, there are only two references from 2018, and 4 from 2017, all the others are even older), as a result, the authors can not provide any example from the last 6-7 years, although for nanotechnology it is quite a long period,</li> <li>2) working in such a competitive field, the authors must formulate clearly what is the difference in their review and 1,450 other review articles on/around this topic, issued for the first 4 months of this year. From those differences, the aim of this paper must be stated. But there is NO AIM in the manuscript. At least it is not claimed.</li> </ol> <p>In plenty of the places the reference/references are missed. For example, "The steady demand of nano-materials in the food processing is because of its non-toxic nature and stability at higher temperature and pressure". <b>Reference is needed.</b> "Nano-technology provides wide spectrum of applications commencing from processing of food , preservation and in the direction of food packaging". <b>References?</b></p> <p>The references are often given at the end of very long paragraphs, and it is not clear enough if the authors took the whole paragraph from one article right as it was or they summarized the content of the whole article in that passage, or what?</p> <p>By contrast, sometimes the authors cite the only reference after every single sentence (8 times in one paragraph), writing in the text that it is from "various reports" (the paragraph about AgNPs).</p> <p>In the introduction, and later in the other parts, the same ideas are repeating redundantly. Could be formulated briefly and without repetitions.</p> <p>I would strongly recommend the authors revising the both tables. If a table summarizes the further literature review, it should be at the end of it, not in front of. Also, it is better to include the references in the tables in order to specify the examples. In table 2, it is not clear what example refers to what advantage, starting from Electronic noses. Also, it is a bit strange when as an example of nanocomposites the authors name nanocomposites. In general, the tables are designed negligently: dots-markers are missing, the lines are stuck together, and because of this, the number of advantages is less than the number of the examples.</p> <p>All the parts, except the one about nanoparticles, lack examples! Since it is a review, the authors need to make a more broad and deep study of the literature.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>I have not detected serious mistakes or heavy unnatural grammatical constructions, however, there were a number of errors (articles, -s, inconsistency of some sentences), so, the manuscript should be language checked. On the other hand, I am not a native speaker, so, the opinion of the other colleagues will be more expert than mine.</p> <p>The order of references is totally messed up. The first reference has N70, the next one is 56, etc. The authors must rearrange them all according to the authors' guide of the journal. The style of the</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	<p>references is messed up as well.</p> <p>The link of the figure 1 with the text has not been found. Actually, I don't think it's a good and appropriate figure, but it is the only one for this article. Indeed, it lacks the graphical material.</p> <p>A title of the section IS NOT a part of the sentence. Please, write the full sentences.</p> <p>"carbohydrate namely dextrin". From the chemical viewpoint, dextrin is not a particular carbohydrate; it is a class of compounds. Is better to call this class dextrins, not dextrin. But probably the authors meant something different.</p> <p>Check the sentence "Silicate nano-particles are widely available in nature, simple processing and lower cost are the reason for usage as a potential nanoparticles." Are you sure that precisely nanoparticles of silica are widely available in nature?</p> <p>"Silver based nanoparticles have smaller size and larger surface area". Smaller than what? Compared to other nanoparticles? Does it depend on the type of metal, I wonder?</p> <p>"Nowadays, silver is more desirable means of packaging material because of its lower propensity in making microbes resistant to it". Is silver a packaging material? More desirable than what? Paraphrase this.</p> <p>"There are number of other nanoparticles such as zinc nanoparticles, titanium nanoparticles, carbon nanotubes which can be used for packaging of food." From this sentence one may think that food is wrapped in nanoparticles. Please, be more precise.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>I recommend this article for serious major revision.</p>	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Aleksandra Mikhailidi</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>St.-Petersburg State University of Industrial Technologies and Design, Russia</b></p>