

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_116403
Title of the Manuscript:	Quality and Risk Assessment for Public Health of Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons in Crude Palm Oil Locally Produced from South-South zone, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalejns.com/index.php/EJNFS/editorial-policy>)

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>Compulsory 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>Yes, the study of PAH in different palm oil samples is an important aspect. The authors evaluated the physicochemical characteristics and health risk analysis of different CPOs produced in selected areas of Nigeria.</p> <p>Quality and Risk Assessment for Public Health due to Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons in Crude Palm Oil Locally Produced in South-South zone, Nigeria</p> <p>Yes, but the full form of abbreviations should be given in its first existence.</p> <p>Appropriate</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Quality of the English language should be improved. In most of the parts, punctuations and grammatical errors are there. These should be addressed.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. Overall, the manuscript is well written and presented the data sufficiently.</p> <p>2. GC-MS data of the PAHs can be provided in supplementary files</p> <p>3. In the abstract full form of CPO should be given in its first existence.</p> <p>4. In the Introduction section, reason behind selecting the CPOs produced in the selected areas of Nigeria should be given. It may be like case studies/instances of cancer etc. in those regions with citation of earlier published works.</p> <p>5. Care should be taken during writing the manuscript in terms of typographical errors like Sv should be SV, repetition of words etc.</p> <p>6. In results and discussion section, definition of the fundamental terms like SV, EV may be avoided. Instead, author should correlate these physicochemical parameters with exposure assessment, cancer risk, margin of exposure, screening value etc. so as to fit with the title.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kandarpa Phukan
Department, University & Country	Handique Girls' College, India