

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">European Journal of Nutrition &amp; Food Safety</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_126760
Title of the Manuscript:	SEAFOOD PROCESSING AND QUALITY CONTROL
Type of the Article	Review Article

## Review Form 3

### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> 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 a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript provides an overview of methods of preservation as well as quality control of seafood that can be useful for researchers who want to enter this field. They can reach a suitable background in this field by reading this manuscript.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Processing is a general and broad concept. Considering that in this manuscript, only one branch of processing, i.e. preservation, is discussed, it is better to change the title as follows:  SEAFOOD PRESERVATION AND QUALITY CONTROL	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The structure of the abstract is as follows: 1- Introduction 2- The goal 3- The result  Only the first part is given, which is very long. So, it is better to summarize the introduction and then the purpose of the study should be mentioned in the abstract. Also, at the end of the abstract, the result of this article should be written in one to two lines.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	In some cases, the names of some subsections must be changed and their order is also not appropriate. In the comments, I mentioned in what order they should be placed.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The content of this section is scientifically correct because appropriate references have been given for the materials of this manuscript that confirm the accuracy of the contents. Appropriate examples are also given. There are a series of problems in the categorization of the content, which have been mentioned in the comments. By correcting them, the contents will be categorized well.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Except for the first reference in the introduction section, which is outdated and should be corrected, the rest of the references are appropriate.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Apart from some minor writing errors mentioned in the comments, the overall quality of the manuscript language is suitable.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	-  PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT	

**Review Form 3**

**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>Alireza Hodhodi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Guilan, Iran</b>