

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_123816
Title of the Manuscript:	Recent Advances and Future Trends in Clean-Label Technology
Type of the Article	Review Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript is significant to the scientific community in that it highlights disturbing foodborne disease statistics and trends, and the call for foods with clean labels. Diseases do not only affect the social side of communities but the economic side as well.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Revolutionizing Food Quality and Safety: Recent Advances in Clean-Label Technology</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Some parts of the abstract appeal for revitalization. For example, the authors should indicate the number of studies used (e.g 60 studies were reviewed) and the area/concepts focused on. It should also highlight the main findings and the contribution to the field.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Some are not necessary, for example, "Definitions of clean label"</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The authors attempted to make a clear difference between natural, organic, and clean-label foods. However, I strongly feel they needed to have a clear methodology where they state how they got the information/data they used. How many articles were reviewed and how did they glean or get these articles. Moreover, scholarly sources would improve credibility and reliability of sources used. I noticed they relied more on anonymous sources most of which were not peer reviewed. This is a good paper with a few loose ends tied.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>More recent scholarly sources should have been used.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The inconsistency of applying the UK and USA English dialects interchangeably was picked. May authors choose between the two and apply it consistently.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Kindly breath more life into the conclusion. Highlight any market growth projections for the clean-label foods, indicate what governments think and say about that, call for action, by policymakers and manufacturers, and lastly, focus on practical recommendations. Indicate the future research directions, at the same time connecting to broader implications. Also be consistet in the use of bullets.</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:	David Chibhoyi
Department, University & Country	Manicaland State University of Applied Sciences, Zimbabwe