

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_125369
Title of the Manuscript:	Traceability System for the Quality of Fresh Tuna Loin (Thunnus sp) Based on Various Handling Temperatures at FPU XYZ Using Quick Response Code
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This is a important manuscript. Author try to establish Traceability System for the tuna fish in case of temperature issue which will prevent it from contamination. At the previous it was done manually but if it is done digitally it will be more efficient.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title "Traceability System for the Quality of Fresh Tuna Loin (Thunnus sp) Based on Various Handling Temperatures at FPU XYZ Using Quick Response Code" is suitable. It accurately reflects the main focus of the study, which is the traceability system, the quality of tuna based on handling temperatures, and the use of QR code technology. The tittle can also be changed like this. "Development of a Traceability System for Fresh Tuna Loin (Thunnus sp) Quality Based on Various Handling Temperatures at FPU XYZ Using Quick Response (QR) Codes"	
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.	The Abstract should be more specific. That means a person will know about the paer by reading the abstract. Firstly authorcan start with the problem what authoris trying to fix or can write about the Fpu. Then authorcan go to his aims or other findings of the paper.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is scientifically robust as it employs standard laboratory methods and statistical analysis (ANOVA) to assess tuna quality under various handling temperatures. The research adheres to food safety guidelines (SNI standards), ensuring technical accuracy. Furthermore, the use of QR code technology enhances traceability, adding practical value to the study.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	The references in the manuscript are a mix of relevant studies, but some could be considered slightly outdated, with many sources from 2020 or earlier. While the cited works provide a good foundation for traceability systems, food safety, and quality management, it would benefit from the inclusion of more recent studies (from 2021 onwards) that focus on advancements in traceability technology and the use of QR codes in food safety. For additional references, I suggest looking into recent articles on blockchain-based traceability in fisheries, as this is a growing area in food supply chain transparency. Studies on the latest technologies in cold chain management and their integration with traceability systems would also enhance the manuscript. Adding references on recent food safety regulations or case studies from key export markets (such as the U.S. or the EU) could further strengthen the discussion.	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	<b>The language of the article is generally clear, but there are some areas where it could be improved for better readability and precision, especially for scholarly communication. Certain sections could benefit from more concise wording and clearer sentence structure to enhance the flow of information. There are occasional instances of missing punctuation and grammatical inconsistencies that may affect the clarity of the content. Overall, while the article conveys the intended meaning, a thorough proofreading and editing process would improve its quality and make it more suitable for scholarly communication.</b>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<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:	<b>Labib Intisar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Rajshahi University of Engineering and Technology, Bangladesh</b>