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	

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

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Slim SMAOUI***
Department, University & Country	***Centre of Biotechnology of Sfax, Tunisia***