

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_129421
Title of the Manuscript:	A comprehensive Analysis for Global Food Security and Environmental Sustainability using Edible Insects
Type of the Article	Review 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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript addresses a timely topic by evaluating the potential of edible insects to contribute to global food security and environmental sustainability. It provides a thorough review of existing literature, incorporating insights into nutritional, environmental, economic, and cultural dimensions. The authors present a convincing argument for entomophagy as a sustainable food source. However, while the manuscript is well-structured and informative, several areas require improvement to enhance clarity, depth, and scientific rigor.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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 recommend removing the references in abstract.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No, some of the references are outdated. The authors should consider integrating recent articles.	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Abstract Strengths: The abstract concisely summarizes the manuscript, highlighting the key findings related to nutrition, environmental benefits, and socio-economic potential. Suggestions: The conclusion in the abstract could be more definitive. Consider explicitly recommending next steps or research priorities.</p> <p>Introduction Strengths: The historical context and rationale for focusing on edible insects are well-articulated. The introduction effectively sets the stage for the manuscript. Suggestions: Provide a clearer statement of the manuscript's objectives or research questions. Avoid redundancy; the same points (e.g., protein content of crickets) are repeated later in the manuscript.</p> <p>Addressing Food Security While the title of the manuscript emphasizes food security, the discussion within the text does not sufficiently address the current global state of food insecurity or the potential of edible insects to mitigate these challenges in detail. To strengthen the manuscript, the authors are encouraged to expand the introduction to include a comprehensive overview of global food security, emphasizing its urgency and relevance. Integrating insights from recent studies, such as the article doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2023.1122331 would provide valuable context.</p> <p>Nutritional Benefits Strengths: This section is comprehensive and supported by well-selected references. It provides valuable insights into the macronutrient and micronutrient composition of edible insects. Suggestions: Include a table summarizing nutrient comparisons between insects and traditional protein sources (e.g., beef, poultry). Discuss potential anti-nutritional factors in edible insects, such as chitin and allergens, in more detail.</p> <p>Environmental Impact Strengths: The section provides strong evidence of the environmental advantages of insect farming, such as reduced greenhouse gas emissions and water usage. Suggestions: Incorporate more recent references to strengthen claims. Include potential challenges, such as ethical concerns and scalability of waste-fed insect farming.</p> <p>Economic Aspects Strengths: The discussion on market trends and income opportunities is engaging. Suggestions: Expand on the economic challenges, such as initial consumer resistance and costs of regulatory compliance. Provide data on economic feasibility in low-income countries.</p> <p>Cultural Perspectives Strengths: The manuscript highlights regional differences effectively, providing examples from Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Suggestions: Add more detail on successful marketing strategies for edible insects in Western cultures. Avoid generalizations; clarify that acceptance varies significantly even within regions.</p> <p>Safety and Regulation Strengths: This section addresses critical concerns about food safety and regulatory frameworks. Suggestions: The discussion on microbial and chemical contamination risks could benefit from quantitative data. Include a figure or flowchart summarizing regulatory frameworks across regions.</p> <p>Research and Innovation Strengths: The section provides a forward-looking view of technological advances and product development. Suggestions: Discuss ethical concerns related to genetic modification or large-scale farming of insects. Include case studies or examples of innovative products entering the market.</p> <p>Conclusion Strengths: The conclusion summarizes the manuscript effectively and underscores the significance of edible insects for global food systems. Suggestions: Provide actionable recommendations for policymakers, researchers, and industry stakeholders.</p> <p>Technical Comments Several sentences are overly long and could benefit from simplification for readability. Figures 1 and 2 require higher resolution for clarity. Ensure all images have appropriate captions and credits. Review the manuscript for minor grammatical errors and typographical issues (e.g., "aneamia" instead of "anemia").</p> <p>Recommendation</p>	

Review Form 3

	Revision Required: The manuscript demonstrates significant potential but requires revisions to enhance clarity, depth, and alignment with scientific standards. I look forward to reviewing the revised version.	
--	---	--

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ahmet Murat Günal
Department, University & Country	Haliç University, Türkiye