

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_112295
Title of the Manuscript:	Microbial, Physicochemical and Shelf-life Evaluation of Stored Sugarcane Jaggery in Different Packaging Materials
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Review Comments

	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><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript is very important as it tries to prescribe the best method and material for packaging no only an important but useful product-Jaggery for the Indians.</p> <p>2. The title matches the content of the manuscript.</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive, covering all the salient points in the manuscript.</p> <p>4. Yes</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. Yes, except that Authors need to substantiate their assertion that sugar stored in an opaque material has a higher shelf life than in a transparent material as also stated in the conclusion.</p> <p>7. Authors should check and correct the sentence in line 18 – 20 in page 2 of the introduction</p> <p>8. Provide the graph showing the wavelength as against the transmittance % for a better comparison in Lines 22 and 23 in page 4 of the results.</p> <p>9. Line 8 of page 5, how ‘mild’ was the change? Please provide the percentage change.</p>	<p>Thanks for appreciation</p> <p>Added and corrected</p> <p>Corrected</p>
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Good</p>	<p>Thanks for appreciation</p>
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is well writing covering a lot of scientific and technical facts that make it suitable for publication after the few corrections.</p>	<p>Corrections incorporated as suggested</p>

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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