

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Food Science Journal</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AFSJ_119596</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Fabrication and Investigation of Gondhoraj (Citrus hystrix) Zest Edible Wrap for enhanced quality and better shelf-life of Chicken Breast</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

## Review Form 1.7

### 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>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></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>1. The manuscript addresses critical issues related to enhancing food and environmental safety using edible food wraps, a topic of significant contemporary relevance. Consequently, the area of study is highly important and relevant to the scientific community.</li> <li>2. The title is suitable.</li> <li>3. The abstract is fairly comprehensive. However, it is missing critical information that will allow readers to quickly comprehend the full aims, objectives and findings of the paper. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The aims of the manuscript were twofold; to evaluate the quality characteristics of the film paper and to evaluate its efficacy in improving meat shelf life. The first aim is clearly outlined in the abstract but the abstract is silent on the second aim.</li> <li>• The abstract study design should also include the meat shelf life trial</li> <li>• The methodology only mentions coliform counts for chicken samples but the study also assessed physicochemical properties (moisture and pH). These should be included in the abstract methodology.</li> <li>• The abstract results for chicken shelf life should include physicochemical results.</li> <li>• The abstract conclusion on chicken shelf life is not in tandem with the objectives. Authors state that <i>“The shelf life study of both coated and uncoated the chicken samples revealed no significant difference (p&lt;0.05), leading to the conclusion that the organoleptic qualities of the chicken are not influenced by GPO”</i>. In the results authors report significant differences in coliform counts for chicken samples. Also, the authors did not investigate organoleptic qualities in their study and therefore cannot conclude on whether the film will affect organoleptic qualities of meat or not.</li> </ul> </li> <li>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</li> <li>5. The manuscript is scientifically sound. However, authors should clarify how the chicken meat was allocated into treatments. For example, authors state <i>“We acquired both pre-packaged and freshly cut chicken meat from Koley market in Kolkata, India. The meat was aseptically diced into cubes weighing 30 ± 3 g. The samples of chicken meat were separated into four groups”</i>. They should clarify if the meat was kept separate as freshly cut and pre-packaged or if it was mixed. How was the meat divided into four groups? Was it random? Does the use of pre-packaged versus freshly cut meat not introduce variation in terms of coliform counts? Did the authors check the microbial counts of the pre-packed and freshly cut chicken samples to determine uniformity?</li> <li>6. The references are sufficient and recent.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The language quality is suitable for scholarly communications. However, the manuscript needs to be checked for editorial errors (tenses, grammar, punctuation etc).</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**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>Chido Chakanya</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Chinhoyi University of Technology, Zimbabwe</b>