

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Archives of Current Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_123810
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Evaluation Of Nutritional Composition, Fatty Acid Profile And Sensory Attributes Of Commercial Plant-Based Meat Analogues And Chicken Nuggets
Type of the Article	Study case

#### **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: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> 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>
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.	Thanks for the opportunity to contribute to the improvement of this article. The article addresses a very topical subject, in the context that climate changes and the carbon footprint of products, including food ones, require changes in consumer behaviour. Nutritional comparison of the two types of food products is welcome to provide as much information as possible to a 21st century consumer	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	In abstract, I suggest the more detailed inclusion of the materials and methods used. In the abstract, I suggest the more detailed inclusion of the materials and methods used. Also of interest would be the selection method of the analyzed samples and how to ensure the representativeness of the batch of which they belong, taking into account the variations in the content of nutrients within the same batch. More details about plant-based meat analogue are needed. The number of samples is quite small, here I understood correctly 3 plant base meat samples and 2 standardized meat products	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	I would add the discussion and limitations section of the study	
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.	As a case study, the paper comes to complete a scientific field in development. Completing the article with details about the characteristics (ingredients, method of preparation) of the analyzed samples refines the information and increases its scientific value.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No suggestions	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

#### 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:	Daniela Cirnatu
Department, University & Country	Vasile Goldis Western University, Romania