

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_93264
Title of the Manuscript:	Antioxidant and Antibacterial Activity of Caulerpa Flour (Caulerpa sp.) As Functional Food Raw Material
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:

<https://www.journalafsj.com/index.php/AFSJ/editorial-policy>

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>Abstract : There are still mistakes in writing the names of plant species. The results of the study need to be rechecked.</p> <p>Introduction : It is better to describe the general antioxidant and antibacterial properties of plants, especially seaweed. What are its advantages compared to other plants. Can be given an example of functional food produced by seaweed, especially C. lentillifera. The writing of plant species is considered and improved.</p> <p>Materials and methods: The materials used are described in terms of their roles and functions. Antioxidant and antibacterial testing methods are more detailed and sourced from which reference. The results of the analysis of variance are not shown in the results of the study.</p> <p>Results and Discussion : There are still many mistakes in writing the names of plant species. The results of statistical analysis are not displayed, the results tend to be descriptive (higher or lower). Writing that contains procedures should be written in the methods section. The results of the writing do not match what is written in the discussion with the abstract and conclusion. In discussing antibacterials, other types of bacteria can be added, why only E. coli. Please note that the unit of sample test results must be correct.</p> <p>Conclusion: Please check the data again. Preferably what is in the conclusion must be in the results and discussion.</p> <p>References: Writing references must be complete and in accordance with the rules in the journal.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	There are still many errors in writing, namely the writing of plant species. At the beginning of the sentence must be capitalized.	
Optional/General comments	In general, the description in the manual is good. Need a little improvement in the suitability of research results and additions in the discussion.	

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hernawati
Department, University & Country	Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia (UPI), Indonesia