

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_127357
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of Varying Drying Air Temperatures on Physico-chemical and Nutritional Characteristics of Bael (Aegle marmelos) Pulp
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.	The availability of certain foodstuffs throughout the year continues to be a challenge for many populations. Find conservation techniques that extend the shelf life of these food products, contribute to improve the food security of populations. On the basis of the above I issue a favourable opinion for the publication of this article which contributes to improve the shelf life of an important fruit	
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 the 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 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 methodology used in this study is appropriate The results obtained are interesting	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	YES	
Minor REVISION comments	YES	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tables 1, 2 and 3: add footnote (SEM, CD, CV, L*, a*, b* ??????) - Fig 1 gives information present in table 1. Remove figure 1 - Table 3 and Fig 2 show the same information. Choose one 	

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:	Ulrich Landry Kamdem Bemmo
Department, University & Country	Higher Teacher Training College, University of Bertoua, Cameroon