

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">European Journal of Nutrition &amp; Food Safety</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_123826
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>High Pressure Processing: Extending Shelf Life and Preserving Nutrients</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	This manuscript allows to gather and analyze the existing knowledge on this preservation method, which is increasingly used in the food industry. It also allows to identify the advantages and disadvantages of this technique, as well as its impact on the nutritional and organoleptic quality of food. The results of this manuscript will serve as a valuable reference base for researchers, food industry professionals and decision-makers, thus facilitating a better understanding and informed adoption of this technology.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<p><b>No</b> I suggest that the study focus on data obtained over the last 10 years. This will allow an inventory of recent data. In this context, I propose the following titles:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. State of play of high-pressure treatment in food preservation during the last ten years: a review</li> <li>2. Evaluation of the effects of high-pressure food treatment during the last ten years: a review</li> </ol>	
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.	I suggest to the authors to rewrite the abstract by integrating the summaries of the main results.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No, I proposed in the manuscript to review the structure of certain parts	
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 manuscript contains interesting scientific information. However, this information is superficial for some parameters. Furthermore, in my opinion, it would be interesting to focus in this manuscript on recent data (last ten years) on HPP in food processing. For most of the sections, the authors are not appropriate.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Many references are recent; however, others are very old.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	For each section, authors must provide scientific information, ensuring that the authors are correct. Some are not appropriate.	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<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>Moriken Sangare</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Higher Institute of Veterinary Sciences and Medicine, ISSMV, Guinea</b>