

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>European Journal of Nutrition &amp; Food Safety</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_EJNFS_105634</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Enhancement of Refrigerated Shelf Life of Foods Against Microbial Spoilage Using Indian Spices</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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.journalejns.com/index.php/EJNFS/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>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Manuscript is an interesting one. Our day today life has become completely dependent on stored food and in context to this, the paper may be accepted.</p> <p>The work done suitably defines the title of the paper.</p> <p>Abstract is comprehensive including the short summary of the entire work.</p> <p>Structurally, all the tables should be included at one place not in a divided manner; in the paper, the table 1 is before reference and table 2 &amp; 3 are after the reference.</p> <p>The scientific approach of the authors towards justification of the aim is not sufficient. Only colony formation can never be the only criteria to check or enhance the shelf life. The inclusion of physical observation, occurrence of fermentation, change in pH (for all the formulations), effect of presence of turmeric (as present in all the possible powder mixtures of the spices), etc are yet to be experimented.</p> <p>References should be rewritten following the sample paper. (All the references are not in a similar format, some having journal name (last reference) some are not having). Recent reference must be included.</p> <p>The most recent one (Shouket Sumaria, Khurshid Shazia, et al., 2023. Enhancement of shelf life of food items via immobilized enzyme nano-particles on varied supports. A sustainable approach towards food safety and sustainability. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2023.112940">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2023.112940</a> OR Sharma Heena, OzogulFatihet al., 2023. Impact of lactic acid bacteria and their metabolites on the techno-functional properties and health benefits of fermented dairy products. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1080/10408398.2021.2007844">https://doi.org/10.1080/10408398.2021.2007844</a>) is nowhere relates to the exact context or aim or objective of the research work.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	<p>Please follow Grammarly or spellcheck for making the manuscript error free.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The research support is not sufficient to support and justify the title of the paper,</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Snigdha Pattnaik</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Siksha O Anusandhan, India</b>