

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_125785
Title of the Manuscript:	A REVIEW ON BIOCONVERSION OF FOOD WASTES AND BY-PRODUCTS TO VALUE ADDED PRODUCTS
Type of the Article	

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.	This is an important article: more waste accumulation reflects missed opportunities. It provides a foundation for rethinking our waste from a socioeconomic and environmental perspective. Since we have a variety of waste from the food sector, I hope you will consider using diagrams to cover this spectrum. Or could you narrow it down to one waste type managed using many value-addition strategies or many waste types versus one value-addition approach? I am providing an opinion that this may give you opportunities to delve deeper into one waste type or one value-addition approach.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Proposal: A REVIEW ON BIOCONVERSION OF FRUIT WASTES AND BY-PRODUCTS TO VALUE-ADDED PRODUCTS I propose replacing 'food' with 'fruit' since the article discusses grapes, tomatoes, bananas, citrus...	
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.	It is elaborate. I recommend that you give more details on the methods and methodology used in the article.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Appropriate. Please consider adding a critique section. Elaborate on the potential drawbacks of these waste management approaches.	
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.	It uses technical terms in a simplified manner. I recommend incorporating some diagrams about the techniques to make the script more understandable. Now that the topic is broad, please consider adding more techniques, perhaps in a Table format with summarised captions. Similarly, challenge each technique by providing what other authors find inappropriate about these strategies.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	
Optional/General comments	You may want to narrow it down to 'value-addition to mango/banana/tomatoes...waste using thermal conversion'. This way, you will find more information and detailed arguments to support and scientifically critique a strategy or more.	

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:	Kibet Tonui
Department, University & Country	Kenya