

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">European Journal of Nutrition &amp; Food Safety</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_127270
Title of the Manuscript:	Proximate, Vitamin And Antinutritional Content Of Fresh And Roasted Tympanotonus fuscatus Harvested From Bundu Creek, Rivers State.
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>

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 1: Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	<b>The paper elaborates on a current topic, and represents an original scientific paper that deals with determining the nutritional and antinutritional composition of fresh and roasted <i>Tympanonus fuscatus</i>.</b>	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<b>The title of the paper is appropriate and reflects its content.</b>	
<b>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.</b>	<b>The abstract of the article is comprehensive and contains everything that an abstract should contain. I would not add or subtract anything.</b>	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	The manuscript is scientifically accurate, adequately describes the methods used, correctly presents the results and supports them with an appropriate discussion. Conclusions are correctly drawn and appropriate literature is used.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The references used are appropriate and recent, which speaks to the topicality of the chosen topic of the paper.	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	the language is understandable and appropriate for a scientific paper	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<b>The paper is current, with a very interesting topic, and it is written appropriately for a scientific paper that I believe should be published in your journal.</b>	

#### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>Natalija Atanasova-Pancevska</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>UKIM, North Macedonia</b>