

**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>
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript offers valuable insights into the integration of advanced omics technology and traditional HACCP methods for seafood quality control. It highlights omics tools' role in identifying microbial spoilage at a molecular level, which is essential for improving seafood quality and food safety. This information is critical as it bridges innovative scientific techniques with practical applications in food safety, making it relevant to researchers, industry practitioners, and policy-makers. Overall, the manuscript contributes to the enhancement of food security and consumer safety through quality management in seafood processing.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>The title "<b>SEAFOOD PROCESSING AND QUALITY CONTROL</b>" is too broad and does not reflect the paper's specific focus on the application of omics technologies for detecting microbial spoilage and improving seafood safety and quality control.</p> <p>The authors can modify the above or given title to: "<b>A Review of Omics Technologies in Seafood Safety and Quality Control: Integrating Modern Approaches with Traditional Practices</b>," which better captures the focus on omics technologies and their integration with traditional methods in seafood safety and quality control</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The abstract is clear but could be improved by clarifying the integration of omics technologies with HACCP in the sentence "On the other side HACCP is also considered for quality control," and making the phrase "helps in maintaining food quality" more specific by explaining how omics aids in identifying pathogens and spoilage, while also rephrasing "Preservation techniques are classified into 3 categories" to a more concise form like "Preservation techniques include traditional, modern, and emerging methods."</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>The subsections are generally clear and follow a logical progression from technology introduction to applications in seafood spoilage control. However, a more distinct division between traditional HACCP methods and omics technology applications would enhance clarity. Creating a summary or comparison table for traditional vs. modern techniques might also improve readability.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically robust and correctly underscores omics technology as a transformative approach in food microbiology. It aptly details the types of omics technologies and their applications in seafood spoilage management. Additionally, the manuscript explains the advantages of integrating HACCP with omics approaches to enhance microbial spoilage control. This technical soundness makes it a reliable reference for food scientists and quality control practitioners.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> -</p>	<p>The references are recent and appropriate, covering key sources in omics technology and food safety. However, to strengthen the scientific depth, few additional references discussing specific microbial spoilage in various seafood types could be included. The authors may also consider adding recent publications on omics applications in analyzing specific seafood microbiota.</p> <p>In some cases, the journal name is missing, while some are added twice, please crosscheck avoid any missing or extra references.</p>	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	While the language is generally suitable, there are some areas where clarity could be improved. For example, the phrasing around omics tools and HACCP could be refined to improve readability, especially in sections with technical terminology. Consider rephrasing to make the manuscript more accessible to a broader scientific audience. Additionally, ensure that all acronyms are spelled out at their first appearance.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>The manuscript provides valuable insights into seafood quality control, but it would be helpful to discuss potential challenges or limitations of implementing omics in traditional HACCP systems. This would present a balanced view and offer a more comprehensive analysis for readers. Additionally, a section on future directions and the potential of emerging technologies in seafood safety could add depth to the manuscript. It is up to authors if possible.</p> <p>Please crosscheck to avoid repetition of the same meaning sentences</p> <p>Please ensure that headings are not written in bold letters, correct this throughout the manuscript, correct spacing and adhere to the journal's guidelines</p> <p>PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT</p>	

### **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)
<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>Shahid Gul</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>ICAR – Central Institute of Fisheries Education, India</b>