

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>European Journal of Nutrition &amp; Food Safety</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_EJNFS_115462</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of Low-Intensity Pulsed Electric Field Treatment on Lycopene, Ascorbic acid, and Color of Tomato Juice</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Research article</b>

## 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> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript holds significance for the scientific community. It explores novel methods for enhancing the nutritional value and quality of tomato-based products, particularly through the application of pulsed electric field (PEF) technology.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable. <b>Suggestion:</b> "Enhancing Nutritional Quality and Color Stability of Tomato Juice through Low-Intensity Pulsed Electric Field Treatment"</p> <p>3. Yes, while the abstract provides an overview of the study, there is room for improvement. It could be enhanced by focusing more on summarizing the key findings and implications of the research while reducing unnecessary details about the methodology. This would make the abstract more concise and easier for readers to grasp the significance of the study.</p> <p>4. Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5. The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. Yes, the references are sufficient and recent. If there are additional references mentioned in the manuscript, they should be included to ensure completeness.</p> <p>The manuscript includes marked areas for improvement with corresponding suggestions for enhancing language and English quality.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes, the language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communication, but there is room for improvement.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>1. In the abstract, it is advisable to focus solely on presenting the results rather than describing the methodology. This will enhance clarity and conciseness.</p> <p>2. There are grammatical mistakes present throughout the article that need improvement for better readability and comprehension.</p> <p>3. The introduction section requires further exploration to meet the minimum word count requirement for research articles, which is typically around 4000 words.</p> <p>4. The introduction part should be enhanced to provide more comprehensive background information and context for the study.</p> <p>5. In the material and methods section, include paper references and provide detailed methodology, particularly in the Determination of colour subsection.</p> <p>6. Improve equations presented in the material and methods section for better clarity and accuracy.</p> <p>7. The results and discussion section is well-written but lacks a dedicated discussion part. It is recommended to include a discussion section to interpret the results and relate them to existing literature.</p> <p>8. Change "mL" to "ml" consistently throughout the article for uniformity.</p> <p>9. Ensure that all figures follow the same format, such as adding a solid border to Figure 4 to improve visual consistency.</p> <p>10. Enhance the conclusion section by providing a concise summary of the findings, insights gained, and potential implications of the study within the specified word limit of 150-200 words.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<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>
<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>Ramani Akshay Rajeshbhai</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>ICAR-National Dairy Research Institute, India</b>