

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_127355
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of the Nutritional Profile and Shelf-life of Cuisines Sold in Selected Restaurants for Family Consumption in Urban-Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria
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>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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 valuable insights into the nutritional profiling and microbial safety of cuisines from Quick Service Restaurants (QSRs) in urban Ibadan, Nigeria. It addresses a significant gap in the literature regarding the nutritional quality of fast food, which is increasingly relevant as families turn to these options due to modern lifestyles. The study's findings could inform public health initiatives and dietary guidelines, promoting healthier eating habits among consumers. Overall, I appreciate the manuscript for its practical implications for family nutrition and food safety.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable but could be more concise. A suggested alternative could be: "Nutritional Profile and Microbial Safety of Quick Service Restaurant Cuisines in Urban Ibadan, Nigeria."	
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 abstract is mostly comprehensive; however, it could benefit from a clearer conclusion that emphasizes the implications of the findings. Adding a sentence that summarizes the significance of the study for public health and dietary practices would enhance its impact.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and overall structure of the manuscript are appropriate, facilitating a logical flow of information. The methods, results, and discussions are well-defined, making it easy for readers to follow the research process.	
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 manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness through its systematic approach to data collection and analysis, adhering to established methods like proximate analysis and microbial load evaluation. This attention to methodological detail supports the validity of the findings.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are generally sufficient and include relevant studies, though some could be updated to include more recent literature on nutrition and food safety. Including additional studies on the impact of fast-food consumption on health outcomes may strengthen the manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Overall, the language quality is suitable for scholarly communication, though there are minor grammatical errors and awkward phrasings that could be improved for clarity. A thorough proofreading is recommended to enhance readability and ensure professional presentation.	
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Morris Brako
Department, University & Country	Iowa State University, United States of America