



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		
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In line 7, mad should be replaced with made. 2. In line 21, the sentence should end with full stop. 3. Erlenmayer spelling mistakes in lines 65 & 67. 4. In Table 1, the amount of skim milk and refined sugar the comma should replaced with dot. 5. In line 111, in ware should be replaced with were. 6. In Table 2, the average value, comma should replaced with dot. 7. Figure 1, caption should be aligned. 8. In Table 3, the average value, comma should replaced with dot. 9. In Table 4, , the average value, comma should replaced with dot. 10. Lines 278 & 279 should be re written. 11. In line 279, the word number should replaced with amount. 12. In Table 5, , the average value, comma should replaced with dot. 13. The other concentrations also should be compared for the moisture content and fibre content. 14. In Table 10, , the average value, comma should replaced with dot. 15. Bayes should be written as Bayes 16. The References should be cited in the text as in the chronological order. The author has cited the references in the text randomly. 	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	K. Anandakumar
Department, University & Country	Swamy Vivekanandha College of Pharmacy Tiruchengode, India