

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_120472
Title of the Manuscript:	Amino Acid Profile and Mineral Content Variations in Gastropod Species (<i>Archachatina marginata</i>, <i>Achatina achatina</i>, <i>Tympanotanus fuscatus</i>, and <i>Pachymelania aurita</i>): Implications for Dietary Enrichment.
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://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	1. THIS TYPE OF RESEARCH ENCOURAGES THE EXPOSURE OF FORTIFIED FOOD TO FIGHT AGAINST MALNUTRION. 2. THIS MANUSCRIPT LACKS THE PICTORIAL PRESENTATION OF THE PRODUCT, PROCESS FLOW CHART AND RESULTS. 3. THE WORK IS SIMPLE AND INFORMATIVE ABOUT THE NUTRITIONAL ASPECTS.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	YES	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	YES	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	YES	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	THIS MANUSCRIPT LACKS THE PICTORIAL PRESENTATION OF THE PRODUCT, PROCESS FLOW CHART AND RESULTS. WHEN WE TALK ABOUT PROCESS PRODUCTS, IT SHOULD REQUIRED TO REPRESENT THE PROCESS OF THE PRODUCT IN PICTORIAL OR FLOW CHART FORM FOR ESSY TO UNDERSTAND AND IT HELPS THE NEWCOMER.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. =	YES	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	YES	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	CORRECT THE GRAMMATICAL ERROR.	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Amarjeer Kumar
Department, University & Country	Veer Kunwar Singh University, Rohtas Mahila College, India