

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">European Journal of Nutrition &amp; Food Safety</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_126081
Title of the Manuscript:	Heat Penetration Characteristics and Quality evaluation of Ready-to-Eat Pangasius Fish Fillet Chunks ( <i>Pangasius hypophthalmus</i> ) in Masala Using Flexible Retort Pouches
Type of the Article	

#### General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

#### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> 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.	This manuscript will provide new vistas to scientific community on thermal process standardization of a new important freshwater fish species, Pangasius The heat penetration parameter and quality evaluation factors could be act as reference material for future study on this type of work The work will provide insights, in the field of food science and technology in general and fish processing technology in particular, to develop and popularise the ready to eat value added product to the young and innovative scientific community for their future research plan.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Minor modification is suggested 'Heat penetration characteristics and quality evaluation of Pangasius ( <i>Pangasius hypophthalmus</i> ) fillet chunks in masala using retort pouches'	
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.	In the abstract 'total process time' and 'sterility study' results must be included In the keywords: 'TPT' must be defined	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	'pH study' may be included Under introduction section, third paragraph may be deleted, instead recent work on different fish/shell fish in retort pouch may be included Conclusion part may be rewritten	
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.	On what basis two F <sub>0</sub> values were selected for optimization, why not three F <sub>0</sub> values, which are generally selected for optimization of this type of work Fig. 2 must be corrected. It should be as per Fig. 1. The come-up time, retort temperature, F <sub>0</sub> value, and cook value are not corresponding with the graph More study may be cited to justify the result of all parameters under investigation while discussing Very general/broad reasons are mentioned to justify the results, but the reasons should be very specific and must be explained in more scientific way while discussing	

**Review Form 3**

<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>More references must be included to justify the work scientifically in the discussion part</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The quality of language /vocabulary must be scientific to make it a scholarly article. Sentence framing must be improved.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>All units must as per standard form and should be same throughout the manuscript. i.e - Minutes, Hours, Days etc  Mention the source of bacteria stains and the number assigned to them used in the present study  Either use American English or UK English as per the guidelines of manuscript submission  Citation must be indicated for 'Commercial sterility test'  Uniform citation style may be followed as per the guidelines of manuscript submission  In Table 2: 9 min, 8 min: 'min' may be deleted  In section 4.5: total plate count 'unit' must be checked, name of bacteria mentioned must be 'italic'  In Table 4: replace 'fresh' with 'fresh fish' and write 'processed fish' in the top blank row, replace 'small latters' with 'small letters'  In section 4.3: replace 'accomplish' with 'achieve'  In Table 5: replace 'fresh' with 'fresh fish' and write 'processed fish' in the top blank row, replace 'small latters' with 'small letters'  All sub section under section 3. must be included under section 2. (materials and methods) and accordingly other sections may be changed  Under 'Results and Discussion' correct the numbering of sub-sections (4.3 comes after 4.5)  Section 4.5: rewrite the first sentence  Under conclusion section: the total process time is mentioned as 39.79 (F<sub>0</sub> 7.37) and 38.80 (F<sub>0</sub> 8.12), whereas in the Table 2, it was calculated as 26.94 (F<sub>0</sub> 7.37) and 31.37 (F<sub>0</sub> 8.12) respectively.  Justify/rectify  Under section 2.1: dimension of '150200' mm may be corrected  In Table 1: for salt and water, replace 'as required' with 'as per requirement'  Under section 2.4: in first sentence: 'heat penetration data of the process product is recorded' may be changed to 'heat penetration data of the processed product is recorded'  Under section 4.3: the reason for changes in protein, ash and moisture content must be discussed  Under section 4.4: what is the reason for increase in FFA and TBARS value during storage period must be justified with suitable citation  Under section 4.4 (texture profile analysis): State the reason for lower values of textural attributes of the processed fish than fresh fish with proper justification and citation  Under section 4.5 (sensory analysis): the reason for decreasing trend of parameters must be justified with proper citation  In section 4.4: check the value of 'springiness' '1.00 ± 1.42', where 'the standard deviation is more than mean' and the springiness value (1.16±0.23) of processed fish (F<sub>0</sub> 7.37) on 5<sup>th</sup> day higher than the fresh fish (1.00±1.42) justify</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<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:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p>M. Bhargavi Priyadarshini</p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p>College of Fisheries (Central Agricultural University, Imphal, Manipur), India</p>