



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_46377
Title of the Manuscript:	Reduction of some Food-Borne Pathogens in Chicken Fillets Using Aluminum and Silicon Nanocomposite
Type of the Article	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	<p>The abstract was not written well. Study design was not explanatory. Place and duration of experiments- the last statement ---and take 3 months--- is not formal statement. The methodology needs to be recast. The results were not well explained e.g. In challenge studies, HPMC films including Al₂O₃-NPs and SiO₂-NPs at 80 ppm were highly decreasing the 3 foodborne pathogens growth associated with chicken fillets. This should be recast. The conclusion was written with non-professional English Language. This should be recast from----- The results conducted that HPMC films incorporated with nanoparticles (~ 80 nm) at 80 ppm could be enhanced the safety of refrigerated chicken fillets--- to--- The results showed that HPMC films incorporated with nanoparticles (~ 80 nm) at 80 ppm could enhance the safety of refrigerated chicken fillets.</p> <p>Although the manuscript was well designed, the study was poorly executed and reported. The poor English Language of expression makes the work uninteresting to read. There is need for complete English Language editing and revision of the work.</p> <p>The tables do not show the significance of the data and this is very important for data interpretation. This should be included in the revision to show the reproducibility of the study.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	There is need for general revision of the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments	The English Language of expression of the work should be revised.	

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:	Samuel Ayofemi Olalekan Adeyeye
Department, University & Country	Ton Duc Thang University, Vietnam