



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_50713
Title of the Manuscript:	Seaweed Flour Fortification to the Preference Level of Milk Chocolate Bar
Type of the 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>The topic of the research is interesting and could be worth of attention, however the text is incorrectly constructed and carelessly written.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the results presented in the manuscript are at least insufficient - for me, results of chemical analyses are just questionable. The main weakness of the manuscript is the idea that chocolate consumption can improve fiber consumption.</p> <p>The huge disadvantage of this report is lack of verification of the experimental results precision and accuracy – validation of the results and methodology must be performed and results quality should be proved. Several additional information should be complemented: clear procedures must be given, information: were the blank samples prepared along with all the other samples and used for correction of measured signals - must be complemented;</p> <p>Number of significant figures (data given in tables) must be unified according to the formal rules, tables should be also formatted once again.</p> <p>Discussion should be definitely polished: all of the data already presented in the Tables are repeated in the text in the exactly the same form – this is unacceptable.</p> <p>Given references are not based on relevant literature; references section should be corrected and re-edited - list <u>must be</u> rearranged.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>Many editorial mistakes, as well as grammar or language errors are making the manuscript less valuable: the English is must be improved, before any other attempts of publication.</p>	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anna Leśniewicz
Department, University & Country	Wrocław University of Technology, Poland