SCIENCEDOMAIN international

www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_50931
Title of the Manuscript:	The Level of Nori's Relief Made From Raw Seaweed Mixed Gelidium Sp And Eucheuma cottonii
Type of the Article	Data Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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)

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)

SCIENCEDOMAIN international www.sciencedomain.org



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The present work is interesting and relevant to publication in this journal, but some modifications should be made mainly in the introduction and references. The introduction is very vague, bring information about Nori consumption around the world. At the end of the introduction, state the purpose of this paper. References are completely wrong, as they appear during the text and in the reference list.	
Minor REVISION comments	Abstract: "Gelidium sp and Eucheuma cottonii" The species name is written in italics. After the sp has a period. In the conclusion put a colon (:) and start with a capital letter, Keywords: choose words that are not in the title. Line 22: has no roots, stems, and leaves. Correct is: has no roots, stems, and leaves. Line 25: References must be numbered in the order that they appear in the text. Where are references 1, 2, 3 and 4? The first reference that appears is 5!!!! Line 27: Gelidium must be written in italics. Correct this throughout the text!!!! Line 27: "Nori products." What does this period do there? Line 34: the references do not follow the order!!! Correct throughout the text. Line 35: here you should quickly explain what agar. Line 36: "12-48% [11] The quality". Are there two sentences? Where is the period? Line 42: Just like you did here (Rhodophyceae), do for Gelidium too. Line 49 and 50: The species name is written in italics. Correct this throughout the text!!!! Line 49: Just like you did here (Rhodophyceae), do for Gelidium too. Line 68: Where were algae collected? Did you go through any cleaning, acclimatization any treatment before leaving for the experiment? Line 68: Where were algae collected? Did you go through any cleaning, acclimatization any treatment before leaving for the experiment? Line 70 and 71: "Rice water Clean water Salt pepper Sugar Flavoring Sesame oil. Olive oil. Fish sauce." Put periods between each object just as you did before. Or, replace all these periods with commas. Line 93: "1 gram sugar, 0.3 g flavoring". You must standardize, or use gram or g. Line 94: "low heat". What temperature is this? To specify. Line 99: put the period. Line 141: the correct is 130 °C. Line 142: the correct is 600 °C. Line 144: the correct is 600 °C. Line 145: Put photos of the final noris, this will add work. Line 201: put the period.	
	to E). Switch to percentages, making it easy to understand. Line 343: the correct is 70 °C. References: References are not in accordance with the journal format. Where is the Acknowledgements, the Competing interests and the Authors' contributions?	

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)

SCIENCEDOMAIN international www.sciencedomain.org





SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Débora Tomazi Pereira
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Santa Catarina, Brazil

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)