

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research |
| 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

| Compulsory REVISION 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> |
|---|--|---|
| <p>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.</p> | <p>The manuscript provides significant insights into the traceability systems in the food industry, focusing on fresh tuna loin quality control through QR Code technology. Its relevance is underscored by the increasing global demand for transparency and safety in food supply chains. The use of QR Codes for real-time data access on fish handling and processing enhances traceability, offering a novel approach to ensuring food safety and quality. I appreciate the comprehensive integration of laboratory data, supply chain analysis, and technological solutions, which is pivotal for stakeholders in the seafood export market to meet international standards.</p> | |
| <p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> | <p>The title is suitable as it accurately reflects the manuscript's content, focusing on the traceability of tuna loin quality and the innovative use of QR Codes in managing temperature variations in the supply chain. However, an alternative could be, "Implementing QR Code-Based Traceability for Tuna Loin Quality Control at Different Handling Temperatures".</p> | |
| <p>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.</p> | <p>The abstract is comprehensive, detailing the study's aims, methodology, and significant findings. However, it could benefit from a brief mention of the key results regarding the effectiveness of the QR Code system, which would highlight the practical implications of the study. Adding a sentence summarizing the main outcome, such as "The QR Code system proved effective in ensuring the adherence to quality standards across all supply chain stages," could provide a clearer snapshot of the research impact.</p> | |
| <p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> | <p>The structure of the manuscript is well-organized, methodically delineating the research process from data collection and sample testing to QR Code implementation. Each section is logically sequenced, facilitating easy understanding of the complex processes involved in the study. The headings and subheadings are appropriately used, guiding the reader through the study's methodology and findings systematically.</p> | |
| <p>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.</p> | <p>The manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness, with detailed descriptions of the methodologies used and the standards adhered to, such as SNI protocols for quality assessment. The statistical analysis, including ANOVA, provides a strong basis for the conclusions drawn. The integration of quantitative and qualitative data enhances the reliability of the study. However, ensuring that the sample size and selection process are adequately robust for generalizing the findings would be crucial for further validation</p> | |
| <p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :-</p> | <p>The references are recent and relevant, supporting the manuscript's assertions and providing a solid foundation for the study. However, considering the technological aspect of QR Codes, additional references on recent advancements in QR technology and its application in other food safety contexts could enrich the current citation list. Suggested additions might include recent studies on QR Code durability and scanning reliability under various environmental conditions, which would further substantiate the technological recommendations made</p> | |

Review Form 3

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>The manuscript appears to be scientifically rigorous with a clear description of methodologies, adherence to standards, and detailed reporting of results. The scientific approaches are sound and are supported by relevant references.</p> <p>The structure of the manuscript is well-organized, and the sections are appropriately developed. The use of subsections and headings is well executed, enhancing the reader's ability to follow the progression of the research.</p> <p>Technical Details: The integration of QR Code technology for traceability is innovative and adequately described. The manuscript successfully demonstrates the application of this technology in the traceability of tuna loin, presenting a compelling case for its broader applicability.</p> <p>The abstract comprehensively summarizes the study's purpose, methods, and key findings, although it could be slightly enhanced with results' implications. The title accurately reflects the manuscript's content and focus.</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>Most suggested revisions are minor, such as enhancing the abstract, possibly updating the title for better impact, and adding a few recent references related to the technological aspects of QR Codes. These revisions do not fundamentally change the manuscript's scope or findings but rather enhance its clarity and depth.</p> | |

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Name:</p> | <p>Wan Suryani</p> |
| <p>Department, University & Country</p> | <p>Universitas Medan Area, Indonesia</p> |