

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: **IJAR-56421**

**Title:** 3D printing of fish protein-based functional food

### Recommendation:

Accept as it is .....

**Accept after minor revision...√.....**

Accept after major revision .....

Do not accept (*Reasons below*) .....

| Rating         | Excel. | Good | Fair | Poor |
|----------------|--------|------|------|------|
| Originality    |        | √    |      |      |
| Techn. Quality |        | √    |      |      |
| Clarity        |        | √    |      |      |
| Significance   |        | √    |      |      |

Reviewer Name: **Dr. Priti Gupta**

### *Detailed Reviewer's Report*

#### ***Accept with Minor Revisions.***

- Rheological results are described qualitatively; numerical values, rheological curves, and statistical analysis should be included to support the discussion.
- Optimization of printing parameters is mentioned, but a clear optimization strategy or comparison between different parameter sets is not provided.
- Mechanical strength and dimensional accuracy assessments require clearer methodology and numerical results.
- The Results and Discussion section should more explicitly link rheological parameters ( $G'$ ,  $G''$ , viscosity) with observed print fidelity outcomes.
- The abstract is clear but could include key quantitative outcomes to enhance impact.
- Minor grammatical and stylistic revisions are needed for improved clarity.
- Figures or schematic diagrams of the printing setup and printed structures would improve presentation.
- The reference list is relevant but limited; inclusion of more recent studies is encouraged.