

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_116894
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of seasonal fluctuations in nutritional composition and quality of key commercial fish species in the Ludhiana fish market, Punjab
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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>I consider that it is a basic work, which can be the beginning for various investigations.</p> <p>I consider that this can be modified: Proximal chemical composition of fish that is sold in the market of Ludhiana, Punjab, and its behaviour in seasons of the year</p> <p>I believe that it can be structured, considering small, specific results and placing important conclusions</p> <p>The structure is adequate, however, it is necessary to address various suggestions and observations, with greater emphasis on materials and methods; the sample size, number of samples, type and conditions of the samples, among other factors, are not clear. On the other hand, it is suggested to add a section on statistical analysis, where it is clearly and specifically specified how the data were analysed, how the data are expressed, type of analysis and type of test in the comparison of means. Please review the document in full.</p> <p>I believe that the observations should be addressed, with emphasis on results and discussion, the contribution of research to the generation of new knowledge is not appreciated</p> <p>Adequate</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>It is important that the authors be able to respond to observations and suggestions (review the document in full)</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lucio Gonzalez Montiel
Department, University & Country	Universidad de la Cañada, México