

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">European Journal of Nutrition &amp; Food Safety</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_126370
Title of the Manuscript:	Development and Optimization of Ready to Eat Cobia (Rachycentron canadum) fish Fillet Chunks in Curry Medium Packed in Flexible Retort Pouches
Type of the Article	Research paper

**General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

**Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>  
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The inclusion of "ready-to-eat" and "optimization" signals the practical applications of the research in food technology, highlighting its potential for improving convenience and shelf-life in food products.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Development and Optimization of Ready to Eat Cobia (Rachycentron canadum) fish Fillet Chunks Curry Packed in Flexible Retort Pouches	Corrected
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	-	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The scientific correctness of this manuscript is supported by its clear application of established principles in food science, particularly in the thermal processing of fish fillet chunks. The use of F0 values to assess thermal lethality and ensure microbial safety is an appropriate and scientifically recognized method. The study's approach to measuring heat penetration rates, cooking times, and the impact on sensory quality over a 90-day storage period.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Add some recent references	Corrected
Minor REVISION comments	Language quality of article is ok	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Add colour analysis of product (The changes in the colour parameters during the thermal processing is very important) Add some microbiological analysis e.g. TPC, Clostridium botulinumsince its thermal processed product	Corrected

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	Not applicable