

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_118737
Title of the Manuscript:	Intelligent films based on Lobeira fruit (Solanum Lycocarpum L.) starch for fresh chicken meat quality monitoring
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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I consider the manuscript fundamental for the technique it proposes relating to food safety, with particular regard to packaging, which is the final stage of the HACCP control system. 2. The title of the article is appropriate and correctly informs about the contents of the manuscript 3. The abstract is understandable and clearly summarizes the aims of the article 4. The subsections of the article are clearly indicated by the correct subdivision and numbering of the paragraphs, and allow easy identification of the topics dealt with 5. The article is scientifically correct and presents an innovative system, effective and immediate to monitor the status of food storage. The scientific control and validation methods used are excellent and reliable. 6. The references are exhaustive and support for further checks and insights 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language is clear and grammatically correct and is suitable for scholarly communication. In my opinion the article should be spread to all customers for an informed and conscious consumption.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I must congratulate the author on dealing with a fundamental issue concerning food safety and consumer health. It describes one of the most sensitive issues, usually neglected in the work on food technology, which is the extremely important problem of controlling additives which are widely used in the food industry. The description of the control method that takes into account all the risks indicated by the HACCP system, with a simple packaging system is to be rewarded and encouraged for its large-scale use. Finally, it provides a simple and reliable system to monitor all the parameters that make a food safe and that can be used by anyone.</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:	Bruno Riccardi
Department, University & Country	Previously University of Rome "La Sapienza", Italy