

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_120288
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of Physico-Chemical and Sensory Attributes in Plant-Based Meat Analogue Patties and Chicken Patties
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript holds significant importance for the scientific community as it provides an in-depth comparative analysis between plant-based meat analogue (PBMA) patties and traditional chicken patties. It uncovers notable differences in their nutritional composition, texture, and sensory attributes, which are essential for understanding how well PBMA can substitute traditional meat products. The findings are valuable for improving the formulation and marketability of PBMA, promoting sustainable and healthier dietary alternatives.</p> <p>I find this manuscript commendable because it addresses a critical and timely topic—the advancement of alternative proteins. The thorough methodology and detailed analysis enhance the credibility of the results, offering essential insights that can guide future research and innovation in the food industry.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes, the title of the article is suitable. The title reflects the content and focus of the study, clearly indicating that it involves a comparative analysis of the properties and qualities of PBMA and chicken patties.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The article's abstract is thorough because it provides a clear summary of the differences between plant-based meat analogue (PBMA) patties and chicken patties in terms of their physico-chemical and sensory attributes. It also briefly describes the study's purpose, methodology, major findings, and conclusions.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>From my point of view the manuscript appears to have a structured layout with appropriate subsections</p>	
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>In my opinion, this manuscript provides a thorough and systematic comparison of plant-based meat analogue patties and traditional chicken patties. It employs established analytical methods to assess the physico-chemical and sensory properties, ensuring reliable results. The replication of experiments and use of statistical analysis add to the validity of the findings. Additionally, the discussion places the results within the context of existing literature, making a solid contribution to the field of alternative protein research.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>=</p>	<p>The references in this manuscript are extensive and encompass a wide range of publication years, suggesting a thorough review of the existing literature. There are a total of 31 references cited in the manuscript. The oldest reference dates back to 1955, while the most recent one is from 2024. Overall, the references are recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communications. The manuscript uses clear, precise, and technical language appropriate for a scientific audience.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>It is well-structured, scientifically robust, and provides valuable insights into the comparison between plant-based meat analogue patties and traditional chicken patties</p>	

Review Form 3

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>	No ethical issues

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Esteban Pérez García
Department, University & Country	University of Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, Spain