

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_127270
Title of the Manuscript:	PROXIMATE, VITAMIN AND ANTINUTRITIONAL CONTENT OF FRESH AND ROASTED <i>Tympanotonus fuscatus</i> 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>

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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>1) Introduction: It is well written.</p> <p>2) Aim and Objectives: Aim and objectives are clearly focused and explained.</p> <p>3) Methodology: In this section, A statement of identification of fish sample is needed.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">In sample collection section, the author should write sample collection and preparation. Reference is needed for the sample preparation.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Proper reference for the determination of vitamin and antinutrient Composition should be cited in the manuscript.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">In statistical analysis section check your format and the space gap.</p> <p>4) Result: In result section, it will be better if the author represents these data in a graphical form and mention the significance level in graph.</p> <p>5) Discussion: Discussion part has been written properly. Proper explanation also has been given. Correct the fiber spelling.</p> <p>The research work is good and has a good impact on quality assessment of fish samples. I suggest making revisions of the manuscript in connection with the comments above and recommend for publication.</p>	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	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>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>Sanchari Goswami</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Tripura University, India</p>