Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_EJNFS_115575**
Title of the Manuscript:	**POST HARVEST TREATMENT OF BANANA WITH ARTIFICIAL RIPENING AGENT IMPARTS ON ITS NUTRITIONAL QUALITY AND ANTIOXIDANT POTENTIAL**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

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 1. **Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. **Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. **Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** 4. **Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** 5. **Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** 6. **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	**1-Yes, The manuscript introduces an idea that appears promising or might stimulate others to develop promising alternatives. Technical quality and the experiment proposed by the authors are very-well conducted and can be a good start for industrial application. Present new findings, concepts and theories.** **2- Yes, the title of the article suitable.** **3- Yes, the abstract of the article comprehensive. In general, the manuscript easy to follow and it has a logical flow and the language of the work is concise, logical and accurate.** **4- Yes, subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate. This paper is novel and an advancement of the field** **5-Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct. Provided was very good but the references used were inadequate and non-modern.** **6- The references are not sufficient and not recent. Present new findings, concepts and theories**.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. **Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	**Yes, language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications.** The authors compared their own results with the results of other researchers.	
Optional/General comments	**This article a very deep research report and it is excellent for the publication** The paper easy to follow and it has a logical flow and the language of the work is concise, logical and accurate.	

Review Form 1.7

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:	**Mona Abd El-Kader Mohamed Abd El- Gawad**
Department, University & Country	**National Research Centre, Egypt**