



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_50529
Title of the Manuscript:	Difference in Types of Freshwater Fish as Raw Materials for the Preference Level of Korean Fish Cake
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	<p>In-text citations should be numbered in brackets and listed consecutively in the reference list</p> <p>It should be stated in the text that Padjadjaran University is in Indonesia</p> <p>The English language of the manuscript requires polishing, preferably by a native English speaker because some sentences are difficult to understand. For example "Tilapia is known as white flesh fish which is very resistant to environmental changes because it contains dense and thick meat that has the potential to become a source of raw materials for the processing industry that is managed" and "Freshwater pomfret has a savory and tasty meat taste, although there are enough thorns in the meat". The text also contains a number of spelling mistakes.</p> <p>For Section 3.3, which is the only part which contains any science within this manuscript, the authors state "Chemical tests conducted on Eomuk with different freshwater fish raw materials" but Table 4 only presents data for red tilapia! Where is the other data? Please present data for all 3 species. The following sections are very weak without comparative data.</p> <p>It is very difficult to understand what the authors mean by "Decision making on the value of the alternative weight". It appears to be some weighting system but the logic behind it is not properly explained.</p>	<p>We already change and highlight in the manuscript.</p> <p>We already change and highlight in the manuscript.</p> <p>We already change and highlight in the manuscript.</p> <p>In section 3.3, we only present data for red tilapia because the chemical tests that conducted in this research aims to inform the nutrition content of Eomuk with the best treatment of raw material. Eomuk with red tilapia as raw material is the best treatment according to hedonic test so that is the reason we only present data for red tilapia</p> <p>We already change and highlight in the manuscript</p>
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)	