

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biotechnology and Bioresource Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJB2T_127013
Title of the Manuscript:	Seaweed-Enriched Cookies: A Nutritional and Functional Perspective
Type of the 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)
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 manuscript provides an interesting exploration of incorporating seaweed into cookies to enhance their nutritional and functional properties. While the potential health benefits of seaweed are well-documented, the manuscript could benefit from more detailed evidence regarding the sensory impact and consumer acceptance of seaweed-enriched cookies. Additionally, the review lacks in-depth analysis of potential challenges, such as flavor or texture alterations, which may affect marketability. Overall, the manuscript offers valuable insights into an emerging area of food science but requires further refinement and practical examples to strengthen its contribution to the field.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title, "Seaweed-Enriched Cookies: A Nutritional and Functional Perspective," effectively communicates the manuscript's focus on the nutritional and functional aspects of adding seaweed to cookies.	
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 is mostly comprehensive, but some additions could improve its focus and clarity. To emphasize the study's novelty, it would be beneficial to briefly highlight the importance of seaweed-enriched cookies within the broader field of functional foods and how this research addresses existing gaps. Including a mention of sensory aspects, such as taste and texture, would also enhance the abstract, as these factors are crucial for consumer acceptance. Additionally, linking the use of seaweed to current trends in sustainable and health-promoting foods would provide a stronger rationale for the study's relevance. Lastly, reducing redundancy in phrases like “nutritionally enriched value-added products” and “enhancing the nutritional value” would make the abstract more concise and impactful.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript’s structure is generally logical but could benefit from refinement. While relevant sections on the nutritional benefits of seaweed and its application in bakery products are included, some subsections—such as those on seaweed-enriched cookies and their effects on quality—contain overlapping information, leading to repetition. Merging these sections would enhance clarity and flow. Additionally, the manuscript lacks a balanced perspective; a dedicated subsection discussing challenges, such as taste and texture impacts on consumer acceptance, would provide a more complete view. Finally, certain subsections are dense, and summarizing key points could improve readability, making the manuscript more engaging and informative for readers.	
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.	The manuscript is scientifically grounded, as it uses a wide range of studies to substantiate the nutritional benefits and functional properties of seaweed in cookies. It effectively references specific data, including types of seaweed and their impact on sensory and physical attributes, providing a comprehensive perspective. However, it has some limitations. The manuscript lacks sufficient emphasis on potential drawbacks, such as how higher seaweed concentrations can negatively impact taste, texture, and overall consumer acceptance. Additionally, while it mentions sensory changes, it doesn’t explore solutions or alternative methods to mitigate these issues, which would make the findings more practically applicable. Addressing these limitations would make the manuscript a more balanced and thorough resource for researchers and industry professionals.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The manuscript includes a substantial number of references, covering a broad range of studies on seaweed’s nutritional and functional applications. However, the introduction would benefit from additional recent citations to strengthen the background and relevance of seaweed in functional foods. For example, incorporating https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fufo.2024.100440 could provide current insights into recent advancements in seaweed-enriched functional foods. Similarly, citing https://doi.org/10.3329/bjz.v50i3.65537 would add depth by including regional	

Review Form 3

	research perspectives, especially if this study discusses relevant applications or benefits of seaweed. Adding these references would improve the manuscript's relevance and provide a stronger foundation for the introduction.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The article "Seaweed-Enriched Cookies: A Nutritional and Functional Perspective" demonstrates a scholarly tone and is generally suitable for academic communication, with clear language and organized content. Minor grammatical refinements could enhance sentence flow, and consistent terminology would improve clarity. Structurally, the sections are logical, though starting each with clear objectives could strengthen readability. Overall, with minimal revisions, the language quality aligns well with scholarly standards.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shoebul Islam
Department, University & Country	Bangladesh Fisheries Research Institute, Bangladesh