

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_121974
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Analysis of Public Acceptance of Nanotechnology in Different Food Categories and Packaging Applications
Type of the Article	Review

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript has relevance since nanotechnology has been a growing field in general and it has been increasing in the market and in our daily life's. The importance of demystifying the use of the nanotechnology and provide access to the adequate knowledge to the consumers in general made me appreciate the theme of the article.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is a bit confusing. I would suggest "Nanotechnology in Food: Understanding Public Acceptance Across Different Categories and Packaging Types"	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	They are adequate, although the introduction could explore more the concept of nanotechnology, that looked very poor in the text.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The article explains the use of nanotechnology in the food industry in a very simple way, contributing to a good understanding of the field, especially for people who are new to it. However, if the reader wants to delve deeper into the subject, they should read the references, as the discussions lack depth.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The first reference does not match with its description. The link guides us for a different article, with different authors and it must be reviewed. The second one it's been retreated and has a correction made. I suggest review the references.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	
Optional/General comments	<p>Explain better what its Nanotechnology in the introduction.</p> <p>In the Figure 3: Review the terms "Ugly produce" and "Gene editing foods". For the "Gene editing foods". I suggest the term "genetically improved aliments"</p> <p>How does the "insect proteins" is related with the nanotechnology in this field? The image has a good content, but the text of the section 3.2 would have to be more detailed and abrangent for a better fit.</p> <p>Check your references.</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Gabriela Braga Barros Nhani
Department, University & Country	School of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Paulista State University, Brazil