



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_45065
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Some Preservatives on Nutritional Quality and Sensory Characteristics of Pickled African Walnut (Tetracarpidium conophorum)
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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	- Eliminate Lines 41-42 and the corresponding references - Line 50-51, this sentence should be supported by an adequate reference. Equally, authors should improve it. - Line 51: improve this sentence "Ros [10] listed a lot of health benefits that could be derived from consumption of nuts" - Line 73; remove the pic of Fresh raw African walnut. - Line 88, why authors used these levels: 1, 3 and 5% respectively for citric and lactic acids; Equally I recommend for authors to use the acid and its salt (e.g. lactic acid and sodium lactate playing a role of the buffering capacity of the acid system) - The Materials and Methods section is very long (5 pages), authors should only use the corresponding standards - Line 271: what is the number and age of panelists? - Line 315 eliminate the pic of The developed pickled African walnut (Plate 2) - Line 325, many errors in the superscripts on Table 1. the statistical study must be done properly - Line 326, change for by after 6 weeks - Line 327-328, an unscientific sentence. the authors must demonstrate this idea or remove it - Line 333-339: authors should improve this sentence and cite some major minerals in the corresponding product - Line 341, no significant effect on protein crude, !! - Line 399, change: had significantly lower ($P > 0.05$) by 'had significantly lower ($P < 0.05$)' - In table 2, what is the meaning of absence of Saponin and Alkaloids in the PAWFC PAWFB samples: more explication was used - Authors should present a well and appropriate correlations between the different studied parameters (Antinutrient composition: e.g. Pearson correlation, and a study of the evolution in 6 weeks should be showed) - Line 458-459: authors write: 'Based on the above food regulatory standard, pickled African walnut preserved with lactic or citric acid could be considered safe for human consumption': authors, here, should introduce an evolution of	The lines have been deleted. Additional references have been provided. Also, the sentence was improved. The sentence has been improved. The picture has been removed. Based on related studies. Secondly, these concentrations were tested as to know the effect of different concentrations on selected parameters. The salt of the acid shall be used in subsequent studies. Thanks for your great contributions. Corresponding standards used is stated. The length has been drastically reduced. The number and ages of panellist has been stated. The picture has been removed. The parameters with wrong superscripts have been corrected. Thanks so much for your observation. Correction has been made. The sentence has been removed. Improvement in the sentence has been made. Also, major minerals have been listed. The sentence has been modified based on the results obtained. It has been corrected. Saponin and Alkaloids were not detected from the sample. Thanks for your observation and comments. Correlation of the proximate composition, antinutrients and sensory evaluation results obtained were determined. We sincerely appreciate your great contributions in this manuscript. Relevant microbiological standards have been included.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	microbiological analyses. - Line 496-506, replace the Liking Score Panelist Hedonic Rating in Materials and Methods section	The adjustment has been made.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u><i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></u>	