



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_45608
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Some Packaging Materials on the Storage, Carotenoid Content and Storage Properties of Ground Pepper
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The topic should read "Effect of some packaging materials on shelf life and quality attributes of ground pepper during storage". 2. Please, kindly explain how you determined the thickness of the packaging materials you used in the study stating clearly the instrument used. 3. Section 2.2.4 should read "isolation of moulds" not identification of moulds. Please, give details on how the colonies were counted stating clearly the instrument used. 4. You have no experimental design for the experiment. Please, write out the experimental design for the experiment. 5. What was the control in the experiment? The control will form the basis for comparison. 6. Shelf life must be one of the parameters evaluated in the study. What was the shelf life of the packaged pepper compared to the unpackaged (control)? Please, state clearly. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please, follow the referencing style recommended by the journal. 2. Please, make necessary grammatical corrections within the manuscript. 	
Optional/General comments	Good work by authors.	

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



SDI Review Form 1.6

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

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Liamngee Kator</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Benue State University, Nigeria</i>