



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_61211
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of the ripening stages on some biochemical and nutritional properties in Carica papaya L. (cv. Solo 8) pulp, skin, and seeds
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/journal/10/editorial-policy>)

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	The authors conducted some biochemical estimations of skin, seed and pulp of C. papaya cv. solo 8 at unripe, 1/8, 1/4 and advance ripe stage. Authors tried to compare the carbohydrate, proteins, minerals, fibres in order establish which stage of papaya is nutritious. In any part of the manuscript authors have indicated how does the findings are new or not repeated. Except some grammatical errors and erroneous sentence formation the manuscript is well written with proper citation of references. There was no description of statistical methods adopted but the authors presented all tables with superscript as if appears "ANOVA" was applied. The comments were given on the table in the review format of the Ms (attached). Conclusion may be reduced to two sentences. Correctness of references and proper citation may be checked. Technically the tables of Ms succumbs major drawbacks in presentations without any statistical methods.	
Minor REVISION comments	Follow the attached Ms in review format	
Optional/General comments	Nil	

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)	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Subas Chandra Parija</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Orissa University of Agriculture & Technology, India</i>