

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">European Journal of Nutrition &amp; Food Safety</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_127819
Title of the Manuscript:	Development Of Seaweed Based Value Added Products: Physio – Chemical, Nutritional And Functional Properties And Shelf Life
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

### Review Form 3

#### PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	The manuscript presents an interesting study on the development of seaweed-based value-added products. Given the increasing interest in sustainable food products and their functional benefits, this manuscript could provide valuable insights into the nutritional and functional properties of seaweed. <b>However, the lack of a robust discussion section limits its contribution to the scientific community.</b>	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title is somewhat long and could be streamlined for clarity. An alternative title could be: "Development of Seaweed-Based Value-Added Products: Nutritional, Functional, and Shelf-Life Properties." This version maintains the essential points while being more concise.	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	The abstract summarizes the manuscript well but lacks emphasis on the key findings, particularly the impact of seaweed on product quality, such as texture, flavor, and overall acceptability. It could be improved by explicitly mentioning the study's methodology (e.g., sensory evaluation, statistical analysis) and the primary results.	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	The manuscript is largely scientifically correct, but there are significant issues in some sections: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Statistical Analysis: The manuscript provides limited detail on statistical methods. More clarity on how the data were analyzed is needed, especially if the results are to be interpreted correctly.</li> <li>Sensory Evaluation: The sensory analysis section could be more detailed. It is unclear how consumer preferences were quantified and what specific criteria were used for evaluation.</li> </ul> These areas should be addressed in the revision	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The references are insufficient in terms of both quantity and recency. The manuscript relies heavily on older sources (published more than 5 years ago). To enhance the paper's scientific credibility and relevance, the authors should include more recent studies on seaweed-based food products, especially those published within the last 2-3 years. It would also be beneficial to cite studies that focus on current consumer trends, sustainability, and innovation in the food industry.	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language quality is generally acceptable but requires improvement in some areas. Several sections are wordy or unclear. There are also occasional grammar issues, such as awkward phrasing and inconsistent tense usage. A thorough revision for clarity, conciseness, and grammatical accuracy is required.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	There is a need for a more in-depth discussion of the results and their implications. The manuscript could explore: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The market potential of seaweed-based products.</li> <li>Possible consumer barriers to accepting such products (e.g., taste, texture).</li> <li>Economic feasibility and sustainability of seaweed-based products. Additionally, the shelf-life discussion should be expanded, particularly in terms of storage conditions, preservation methods, and product stability over time.</li> </ul>	

#### 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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Debtosh Patra
Department, University & Country	India