



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>)

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 paper described the making of chocolate bars in which seaweed (different amounts) were added. It is simple and clear, despite some problems in the description of the methods and the English of the paper is somewhat hard to follow, and should be edited. Some explanations are missing.	
Minor REVISION comments	Minor line 26: the first sentence of the paper is weird. Do you mean that it is newly cultivated or among the most cultivated??? Minor, Line 51: tested or tasted?? Minor, Lines 56-57: the last sentence of the introduction is incomprehensible. Minor Table 1: maybe simplify the table, since liens 1 to 4 are identical, the only variable being line 5...and this is repeated in lines 77 to 83 (although the way the numbers add up is not clear : for example, B (5%) contains 5g of seaweed for 104.5 total (4.7%). Thus, the B contains 10 g for 109.5 (9.1%)and C, 15 for 114.5 (13.1%). Why?? Minor Line 111: ware or were? Minor Figure 1: I guess the figure is to show that there is no visual differences between the bars??? State in the legend, please. Minor Line 248: please incorporate the reference like in the rest of the paper. Minor Line 261: the sentence does not make sense. Identical to what?	
Optional/General comments	Overall, a rapid rewriting of the paper should fix most of the down sides.	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	Jean A. Boutin Les
Department, University & Country	France