

## 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>The title matches the content of the manuscript.</li> <li>The abstract is comprehensive, covering all the salient points in the manuscript.</li> <li>Yes</li> <li>Yes</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Authors should check and correct the sentence in line 18 – 20 in page 2 of the introduction</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Line 8 of page 5, how 'mild' was the change? Please provide the percentage change.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	Good	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	The manuscript is well writing covering a lot of scientific and technical facts that make it suitable for publication after the few corrections.	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Rogerson Anokye</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Ghana</b>