

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_127140
Title of the Manuscript:	Slawghterhouse waste recycling improve production and nutritional quality of black soldier fly larvae (<i>Hermetia illucens</i>)
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the 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>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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.	The article presents a relevant study on the rearing of black soldier fly (BSF) larvae in different organic substrates, analyzing the effect on productivity and nutritional quality. There are positive points and aspects that could be improved to strengthen the work.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	"Impact of Different Organic Substrates on the Productivity and Nutritional Composition of Black Soldier Fly Larvae"	
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.	<p>Explain the context and relevance of the study: If it is not already clear, it is useful to include an opening sentence or two that briefly explains the importance of using black soldier fly larvae as an alternative for reusing organic waste and a source of nutrients.</p> <p>Methodology details: If the summary only mentions that different substrates were tested, it may be interesting to specify (albeit briefly) what these substrates were or the type of analysis performed, to give the reader a clearer idea of the approach.</p> <p>Specific and comparative results: In addition to informing productivity and nutritional composition, highlighting the differences between substrates or which was most effective can enrich the summary, helping to quickly understand which substrates are most promising.</p> <p>Relevance of results: Emphasize the practical contribution of the study – for example, mentioning that a specific substrate can be used in larval rearing systems aiming for sustainability, if applicable.</p>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contextualization of the problem: Relevance of using <i>Hermetia illucens</i> larvae for recycling waste and producing biomass. Contextualization of the problem: Relevance of using <i>Hermetia illucens</i> larvae for recycling waste and producing biomass. <p>Literature Review (optional)</p>	

Review Form 3

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In some cases, a review can be inserted to discuss the applications of black soldier flies in sustainable production systems and the types of substrates already studied. <p>Material and Methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of substrates: List and describe the tested substrates, with information about their composition or source, if possible. • Rearing protocol: Explain the larvae rearing process, including environmental conditions (temperature, humidity, lighting, etc.). • Analysis of productivity and nutritional profile: Detail how productivity (e.g. weight, growth rate) and nutritional aspects (protein, lipid content, etc.) were measured. <p>Results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Productivity of larvae on different substrates: Present quantitative and qualitative data on productivity on each substrate. • Nutritional composition: Detailed comparison of the nutritional profile of larvae fed with each substrate. • Statistical analysis: If applicable, include a summary of the statistical tests applied and the significance of the results. <p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comparison with other studies: Relate the findings to previous studies, highlighting similarities or differences. • Practical implications of the results: Discuss the relevance of the most effective substrate for future applications in larval production systems and possible economic and environmental impacts. • Study limitations and future perspectives: Suggest improvements for future research, including testing additional substrates or new rearing conditions. <p>Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of the main findings and their potential impact on sustainable production practices and waste recycling. 	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Overall, the study is well designed and relevant to the area of sustainable animal production. With adjustments in the structure, clarity in the presentation of data, and a more integrated discussion, the article could offer an even more significant contribution to the literature on BSF larvae as an alternative for animal feed.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>No.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>YES</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

	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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Julia Marixara Sousa da Silva</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Federal University of Goias, Brazil</p>