



Home

Author

Review

Author Dashboard

5 Manuscripts with Decisions

Start New Submission

Legacy Instructions

5 Most Recent E-mails

Before You Submit

Manuscripts with Decisions

ACTION	STATUS	ID	TITLE	SUBMITTED	DECISIONED
	ADM: Editorial office, JFPP ADM: Jedidah, Pretilene <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accept (12-Dec-2021) 	JFPP-07-21-1826.R3	Drying kinetics and quality characteristics of <i>Eucheuma cottonii</i> seaweed in various drying methods	01-Dec-2021	12-Dec-2021
	view decision letter ✉ Contact Journal				

ACTION	STATUS	ID	TITLE	SUBMITTED	DECISIONED
a revision has been submitted (JFPP-07-21-1826.R3)	ADM: Editorial office, JFPP ADM: Jedidah, Pretilene <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major Revision (18-Nov-2021) • a revision has been submitted 	JFPP-07-21-1826.R2	Drying kinetics and quality characteristics of <i>Eucheuma cottonii</i> seaweed in various drying methods View Submission	04-Nov-2021	18-Nov-2021
view decision letter ✉ Contact Journal					
a revision has been submitted (JFPP-07-21-1826.R2)	ADM: Editorial office, JFPP ADM: Jedidah, Pretilene <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor Revision (30-Oct-2021) • a revision has been submitted 	JFPP-07-21-1826.R1	Drying kinetics and quality characteristics of <i>Eucheuma cottonii</i> in various drying methods View Submission	22-Oct-2021	30-Oct-2021
view decision letter ✉ Contact Journal					
a revision has been submitted (JFPP-07-21-1826.R1)	ADM: Editorial office, JFPP ADM: Jedidah, Pretilene <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major Revision (12-Sep-2021) • a revision has been submitted 	JFPP-07-21-1826	Drying kinetics and quality characteristics of <i>Eucheuma cottonii</i> in various drying methods View Submission	05-Jul-2021	12-Sep-2021
view decision letter ✉ Contact Journal					

ACTION	STATUS	ID	TITLE	SUBMITTED	DECISIONED
	ADM: Editorial office, JFPP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reject (02-Apr-2020) <i>Archiving completed on 02-Jul-2020</i> view decision letter ✉ Contact Journal	JFPP-02-20-0222	Drying characteristics of <i>Eucheuma cottonii</i> seaweed using greenhouse type solar dryer <i>Files Archived</i> ⓘ	10-Feb-2020	02-Apr-2020

© Clarivate Analytics | © ScholarOne, Inc., 2021. All Rights Reserved.

ScholarOne Manuscripts and ScholarOne are registered trademarks of ScholarOne, Inc.

ScholarOne Manuscripts Patents #7,257,767 and #7,263,655.

[🐦 @ScholarOneNews](#) |
 [⚙️ System Requirements](#) |
 [🔍 Privacy Statement](#) |
 [📄 Terms of Use](#)

Journal of Food Processing and Preservation - Decision on Manuscript ID JFPP-07-21-1826

1 pesan

Anet Rezek Jambrak <onbehalf@manuscriptcentral.com>

13 September 2021 03.12

Balas Ke: anet.rezek.jambrak@pbf.hr

Kepada: jamaluddin6702@unm.ac.id, mamal_ptm@yahoo.co.id

Cc: jamaluddin6702@unm.ac.id, mamal_ptm@yahoo.co.id, m.yahya@unm.ac.id, reski.febyanti@unm.ac.id, andi.alamsyah@unm.ac.id

12-Sep-2021

Dear Dr. Jamaluddin:

We recognise that the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic may affect your ability to return your revised manuscript to us within the requested timeframe. If this is the case, please let us know.

Manuscript ID JFPP-07-21-1826 entitled "Drying kinetics and quality characteristics of *Eucheuma cottonii* in various drying methods" which you submitted to the Journal of Food Processing and Preservation, has been reviewed. The comments of the reviewer(s) are included at the bottom of this letter.

The reviewer(s) have recommended some revisions to your manuscript. Therefore, I invite you to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise your manuscript.

To revise your manuscript, log into <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/jfpp> and enter your Author Center, where you will find your manuscript title listed under "Manuscripts with Decisions." Under "Actions," click on "Create a Revision." Your manuscript number has been appended to denote a revision.

You will be unable to make your revisions on the originally submitted version of the manuscript. Instead, revise your manuscript using a word processing program and save it on your computer. Please also highlight the changes to your manuscript within the document by using the track changes mode in MS Word or by using bold or colored text. Once the revised manuscript is prepared, you can upload it and submit it through your Author Center.

Unique & Verifiable Author Emails

To ensure that all authors and co-authors have a unique account in Journal of Food Processing and Preservation and that their account has a valid email address, the editors now request that every author account has an institutional email address when the revised manuscript is resubmitted. All authors and co-authors should

- log into their accounts at <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/jfpp>
- access their account details by clicking on the drop-down menu where their name appears in the toolbar
- click on the 'Email/Name' tab.
- input their institutional address in either 'Primary E-Mail Address' or 'Primary Cc E-Mail Address'.

Where authors or co-authors do not have an institutional email address they should include an explanation in the Author Cover letter along with any links to websites which can be used to verify the email address such as a University website, Research organization site, etc.

When submitting your revised manuscript, you will be able to respond to the comments made by the reviewer(s) in the space provided. You can use this space to document any changes you make to the original manuscript. In order to expedite the processing of the revised manuscript, please be as specific as possible in your response to the reviewer(s).

Wiley Editing Services Available to All Authors

Should you be interested, Wiley Editing Services offers expert help with manuscript, language, and format editing, along with other article preparation services. You can learn more about this service option at www.wileyauthors.com/eeo/preparation. You can also check out Wiley's collection of free article preparation resources for general guidance about

writing and preparing your manuscript at www.wileyauthors.com/eo/prepresources.

This journal offers a number of license options, information about this is available here: <https://authorservices.wiley.com/author-resources/Journal-Authors/licensing/index.html>. All co-authors are required to confirm that they have the necessary rights to grant in the submission, including in light of each co-author's funder policies. For example, if you or one of your co-authors received funding from a member of Coalition S, you may need to check which licenses you are able to sign.

IMPORTANT: Your original files are available to you when you upload your revised manuscript. Please delete any redundant files before completing the submission.

Author Contribution Indication

The contributions of each author to this work must now be indicated when you submit your revised manuscript. To add Author Contributions using CRediT taxonomy (<http://credit.niso.org/contributor-roles-defined/>), simply click the "Provide CRediT Contribution" link for each author in the 'Authors & Institutions' step of the submission process. From there, you will be able to check applicable Author/Contributor Roles and, if available, specify the Degree of Contribution. You **MUST** provide this information as part of the revision process. Author Contributions will be published with the accepted article and cannot be edited after article acceptance. Therefore you must ensure the Author Contribution information you provide is accurate prior to final acceptance.

Because we are trying to facilitate timely publication of manuscripts submitted to the Journal of Food Processing and Preservation, your revised manuscript should be uploaded as soon as possible. If it is not possible for you to submit your revision in a reasonable amount of time, we may have to consider your paper as a new submission.

Please be sure to format your revised manuscript according to the journal guidelines for authors at <https://ifst.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/hub/journal/17454549/homepage/forauthors.html>.

Once again, thank you for submitting your manuscript to the Journal of Food Processing and Preservation and I look forward to receiving your revision.

Sincerely,
Prof. Anet Rezek Jambrak

Associate Editor Comments to Author
Associate Editor: Rezek Jambrak, Anet
Comments to Author:
(There are no comments.)

Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:
Reviewer: 1

Comments to the Author

- 1) **Abstract: The Abstract must be explained with more details**
- 2) Introduction: Introduction: No attractive introduction that sets a proper background knowledge of the area is presented (what has been already done? which is the real novelty of this study? which is the industrial interest of the work? no proper linking of ideas, etc). The background "why do you do this work" is not clear and should be sufficiently highlighted
- 3) Materials and methods: Authors should provide more detailed information on the *Eucheuma cottonii*. The place of purchase, time of harvest, variety, and so on.
- 4) Materials and methods: Some part of the materials and methods sections are not described in necessary detail and the results obtained are very limited. Improvement of these sections is mandatory.
- 5) Page 6: The number of samples needs to be determined in "Materials and Methods".
- 6) Materials and methods (Page 6, line 3): Authors should provide more detailed information for tarpaulin and bamboo shelf Drying process. Include a schematic of the dryers in the article.
- 7) Further details or the corresponding reference should be included to justify the methods section.
- 8) Replicates should be included in all sections.
- 9) Materials and methods (Page 10, Line 26): Authors should provide more detailed information for Colourimeter CS-10
- 10) Results and discussion section: few related papers were cited and discussed. The discussion should be enhanced to highlight the innovation and the impractical value of current work. Please compare your results and research with the results of other authors and underline what is the scientific novelty in this work.
- 11) The literature review of the manuscript must be improved with most updated papers (i.e. 2020 and even 2021). There are many articles on drying published in Journal of Food Processing and Preservation that you can get help from.

Reviewer: 2

Comments to the Author

"Drying kinetics and quality characteristics of *Eucheuma cottonii* in various drying methods" original article focused on different drying methods with the direct and indirect sun drying methods. In this study, drying methods generally planned according to the results of the effects of sun light (with/without), based on a single foundation. Drying processes could be provided with also several different types of drying methods except for one scientific basis.

Mathematical models were well designed and revealed, however applied analyses were too common, (moisture, color etc.), at least more bioactive compounds could be introduced (as explaining the quality characteristics were one of the aims of the study). By revealing more bioactive potential, the effect of the sun on quality could have been better and clearly explained.

- Page 2 Line 10: "carrageenan content", t must be added.

- Abstract, Lines 20-24: It is not clear which values were higher, must be given in details "tapaulin method had a higher values.."

-Page 3 Line 33-34: "This can increase the dry rate", "could" must be used instead of can here. It sounds more formal and scientific.

Reviewer: 3

Comments to the Author

The manuscript has the potential, however some major overhaul must be made prior publication. Please refer to reviewer comments in attachment file and make substantial correction and improvement accordingly.

Reviewer: 4

Comments to the Author

Seaweeds drying is an interesting topic, but results obtained under only one experimental condition (employing different methods underexplained without many necessary details to reproduce the experiments). Using solar drying, obviously, non-isothermal conditions are present during experiments and modelling is considered isothermal. There are some papers about modelling under non-isothermal conditions. To obtain water diffusivities under these conditions has no physical sense. To neglect the shrinkage of samples is not justified.

The product "quality" is not well measured and discussed. Gel strengths depend on carrageenan content. To select better drying conditions, gels must be formulated with the same carrageenan content to detect possible depolymerization or other structural changes. Additionally, initial carrageenan content in fresh seaweeds must be the same. Differences observed could be mainly given by additional resistances or chemical link between carrageenan-compounds promoted by temperature during drying that hinder the carrageenan extraction in dried product.

Additional comments

English is poor. Many repetitions in the manuscript.

Introduction is not well-written. Better, it is necessary to discuss recent papers about seaweeds drying.

The number of Figures is also excessive and some of them are superfluous (some of them erroneous).

The use of a lot of empirical models to fit drying kinetics has little interest.

Reviewer: 5

Comments to the Author

Dear editor,

The study is a basic drying and thin layer modeling study. The discussion can be strengthened. The originality of the work should be emphasized.

Specific comments

P2 L 13-14 Abstract -- , carrageenan content (t) is missing.

Abstract- Temperature, RH, drying rate, moisture content, moisture ratio, effective moisture diffusivity, carrageenan content, gel strength, and color were measured. Some of them can be measured but some of them can be calculated. Numerical data may be given in the abstract.

Materials and Methods - latitude and longitude information should be given.
Fresh *E. cottonii* was spread thinly on .. please mention thickness.
The models and brands of all used equipments have to be given.
Please mention assumptions.
Please mention drying area.
Please mention repetition.
The statistical findings have to be mentioned in the text such as ($p < 0.05$).
Table 5- 50,365 or 50.365?
Total color change may be calculated.
Figures- Error bars are missing.
Conclusion- suggestion may be given for further studies.

 **Review JFPP-07-21-1826.pdf**
35K

Reviewer comments for manuscripts entitled “Drying kinetics and quality characteristics of *Eucheuma cottonii* in various drying methods”.

1. **Abstract section should be refined, especially in results part.**
2. The authors did provide the several reports regarding the drying process of the seaweed from previous reports. However, the authors failed to provide the previous reports regarding the drying process of present study, i.e. tarpaulin, bamboo shelf, and solar dryer. In addition, the authors must elaborate theoretically on why tarpaulin and bamboo shelf considered as different method, since the two methods are the same open sun drying method.
3. In Materials and Methods section, the authors must define explicitly the dimension of the fresh samples prior the drying process, since effective moisture diffusivity are influenced by the size of the sample.
4. As per manuscript, what was the initial moisture content of the fresh samples before drying process?
5. Add the required amount and the type of salt, as well as soaking time required during sample preparation.
6. As per manuscript in the sample preparation, soaked in salt water to minimize the evaporation process. Please explain your reason.
7. Provide the images of fresh seaweed used for the drying experiment.
8. Please provide exact altitude, latitude, and longitude of location used for drying experiment, since it is common for solar drying experiment. In addition, the authors should mention explicitly the exact date of the experiment.
9. Provide the images of tarpaulin, and bamboo shelf used for the drying experiment.
10. “Fresh *E. cottonii* was spread thinly..” the level of thin should be clearer by adding a image or dimension of the layer.
11. Provide the image of greenhouse type solar dryer, with a close view of the major component, i.e. where were the sample placed, where were the position of thermometer and hygrometer, etc. Furthermore, the authors should explain briefly on how the dryer works in the text.
12. Please provide the details of all measurement instruments used, e.g. the electric balance, the thermometer, the hygrometer, the texture analyzer, the colourimeter etc. Provide the type, manufacturer, accuracy, and range. In addition, explain on how the temperature and humidity were recorded? Manually or digitally?
13. Not all references of the model listed in Table 1 were also listed in reference list. Please add accordingly.
14. As per manuscript, the Eq. 4 is used for slab-shaped materials. Was the sample in the slab form? If not, why do the authors think that the equation is still appropriate?
15. Please provide detailed information of the carageenan concentration of the solution during heating.
16. Since the extraction method used for yield measurement seems were originated from national standard, please give brief explanation of the process. Since the standard may differ from the international standard.
17. For solar drying method, it is common for authors to provide not only the hourly evolution of temperature and relative humidity, but also hourly evolution of solar radiation during drying process in W/m^2 . However, the data of hourly evolution of solar radiation is missing. Please add accordingly to Figure 1 and Figure 2.
18. The legend of Figure 1 and Figure 2 are the same namely “direct sun drying”. Please explain why the temperature and RH data with solar dryer and direct drying under the sun have the same data. Did you enter the wrong figure?
19. The authors must explain explicitly on how the product was stored from preventing moisture content absorption into the product during drying pause at night.
20. Why the drying experiment only conducted for two days with 19 hours in total? Has the equilibrium moisture content been achieved? Is it any theoretical or practical consideration for the drying duration?

21. As per manuscript, the final moisture contents were 12.066% (db), 16.066% (db), and 13.643% (db) for tarpaulin, bamboo shelf, and solar dryer. However, in page 13 line 2-3, the authors stated that the lowest final moisture content was produced by solar dryer. Please correct accordingly.
22. Please check the units of drying rate because the authors write different units in Table 2 (%/hour) and Figure 4 (%db/h).
23. In Statistical Analysis sub-section, the authors considered five statistical parameters to obtain the fittest model, namely R^2 , χ^2 , $RMSE$, SSE , and EF . However, in Results and Discussion section, only two of five statistical parameters used (Table 3). All considered statistical parameters should available in Table 3. Please give proper argument or correct accordingly.
24. What is 'Metode Pengeringan' on the header of second column of Table 3?
25. The authors should explain more about the result of L^* , a^* , b^* on chromatization diagram to know how the changes of each color values (L^* , a^* , b^*) affects the color change of the dried *E. Cottonii*.
26. The images of dried samples from each drying method must be provided.
27. Not all reference mentioned in text are available in reference list, e.g. Wang et al. (2011).
28. Please consider to use English-language reference. The journal is intended for broader potential international reader, hence reputable reference is a must. Please read 'Guide for Authors' for further details regarding non English-language reference.

Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:
Reviewer: 1

Comments to the Author

- 1) Abstract: The Abstract must be explained with more details
We have added information and explained it with more detail.
- 2) Introduction: Introduction: No attractive introduction that sets a proper background knowledge of the area is presented (what has been already done? which is the real novelty of this study? which is the industrial interest of the work? no proper linking of ideas, etc). The background "why do you do this work" is not clear and should be sufficiently highlighted
We have added and completed the information in the introduction section.
- 3) Materials and methods: Authors should provide more detailed information on the *Eucheuma cottonii*. The place of purchase, time of harvest, variety, and so on.
We have added and completed more detailed information regarding location points, harvest times, and sample varieties.
- 4) Materials and methods: Some part of the materials and methods sections are not described in necessary detail and the results obtained are very limited. Improvement of these sections is mandatory.
We have added and completed more detailed information in the materials and methods as well as the results and discussion section, including sample preparation, drying mechanisms, analyses, additional references, and additional explanation in the results and discussion section.
- 5) Page 6: The number of samples needs to be determined in "Materials and Methods".
We have added the number of samples required to be determined in the materials and methods section.
- 6) Materials and methods (Page 6, line 3): Authors should provide more detailed information for tarpaulin and bamboo shelf Drying process. Include a schematic of the dryers in the article.
We have added and completed more detailed information about tarpaulin and bamboo shelf drying process, including a schematic of the dryers.
- 7) Further details or the corresponding reference should be included to justify the methods section.
We have added additional references to complete more detailed information in the methods section.
- 8) Replicates should be included in all sections.
We have added information about repetition in the article.
- 9) Materials and methods (Page 10, Line 26): Authors should provide more detailed information for Colourimeter CS-10
We have added more detailed information regarding the specifications of the Colourimeter CS-10 tool in the article.
- 10) Results and discussion section: few related papers were cited and discussed. The discussion should be enhanced to highlight the innovation and the impractical value of current work. Please compare your results and research with the results of other authors and underline what is the scientific novelty in this work.

We have added more detailed explanation and completed the article with related references in the results and discussion section.

- 11) The literature review of the manuscript must be improved with most updated papers (i.e. 2020 and even 2021). There are many articles on drying published in Journal of Food Processing and Preservation that you can get help from. We have reviewed the literature and added the latest references, especially articles published in Journal of Food Processing and Preservation.

Reviewer: 2

Comments to the Author

“Drying kinetics and quality characteristics of *Eucheuma cottonii* in various drying methods” original article focused on different drying methods with the direct and indirect sun drying methods. In this study, drying methods generally planned according to the results of the effects of sun light (with/without), based on a single foundation. Drying processes could be provided with also several different types of drying methods except for one scientific basis.

We have added more detailed explanation about drying method in the article.

Mathematical models were well designed and revealed, however applied analyses were too common, (moisture,color etc.), at least more bioactive compounds could be introduced (as explaining the quality characteristics were one of the aims of the study). By revealing more bioactive potential, the effect of the sun on quality could have been better and clearly explained.

We have added a better and clearer description of the quality characteristics and information about bioactive potential.

- 1) Page 2 Line 10: “carrageenan content”, t must be added.
We have fixed some typos.
- 2) Abstract ,Lines 20-24: It is not clear which values were higher, must be given in details “tapaulin method had a higher values..”
We have added more detailed information in abstract section.
- 3) Page 3 Line 33-34: “This can increasre the dryint rate”, “ could” must be used instead of can here. It sounds more formal and scientific.
We have fixed the sentence.

Reviewer: 3

Comments to the Author

The manuscript has the potential, however some major overhaul must be made prior publication. Please refers to reviewer comments in attachment file and make substantial correction and improvement accordingly.

Reviewer comments for manuscripts entitled “Drying kinetics and quality characteristics of *Eucheuma cottonii* in various drying methods”.

- 1) Abstract section should be refined, especially in results part.
We have fixed and added more detail information.
- 2) The authors did provide the several reports regarding the drying process of the seaweed from previous reports. However, the authors failed to provide the previous reports regarding the drying process of present study, i.e. tarpaulin, bamboo shelf, and solar dryer. In addition, the authors must elaborate theoretically on why tarpaulin and bamboo shelf considered as different method, since the two methods are the same open sun drying method.
We have added more detailed information about drying methods with additional references.
- 3) In Materials and Methods section, the authors must define explicitly the dimension of the fresh samples prior the drying process, since effective moisture diffusivity are influenced by the size of the sample.
We have added more detailed information on the quantity, weight, and thickness of the fresh samples in the materials and methods section.
- 4) As per manuscript, what was the initial moisture content of the fresh samples before drying process?
We have added information about the initial moisture content of fresh sample before drying process.
- 5) Add the required amount and the type of salt, as well as soaking time required during sample preparation.
We have added information about seawater and its salinity as well as completed the details of the soaking process.
- 6) As per manuscript in the sample preparation, soaked in salt water to minimize the evaporation process. Please explain your reason.
We have added it in article.
- 7) Provide the images of fresh seaweed used for the drying experiment.
We have added the images of fresh seaweed.
- 8) Please provide exact altitude, latitude, and longitude of location used for drying experiment, since it is common for solar drying experiment. In addition, the authors should mention explicitly the exact date of the experiment.
We have added and completed more detailed information about experiment location point and the date of the experiment.
- 9) Provide the images of tarpaulin, and bamboo shelf used for the drying experiment.
We have added the images of tarpaulin, and bamboo shelf used for the drying experiment.
- 10) "Fresh *E. cottonii* was spread thinly.." the level of thin should be clearer by adding a image or dimension of the layer.
We have added information about the thickness of fresh sample and additional images for each drying method.
- 11) Provide the image of greenhouse type solar dryer, with a close view of the major component, i.e. where were the sample placed, where were the position of thermometer and hygrometer, etc. Furthermore, the authors should explain briefly on how the dryer works in the text.
We have added more detailed information about solar dryer in the material and methods section.
- 12) Please provide the details of all measurement instruments used, e.g. the electric balance, the thermometer, the hygrometer, the texture analyzer, the colourimeter etc. Provide the type, manufacturer, accuracy, and range. In

addition, explain on how the temperature and humidity were recorded?
Manually or digitally?

We have added more detailed information about all measurement instruments used in the materials and methods section.

13) Not all references of the model listed in Table 1 were also listed in reference list. Please add accordingly.

We have added and completed all references in Table 1.

14) As per manuscript, the Eq. 4 is used for slab-shaped materials. Was the sample in the slab from? If not, why do the authors think that the equation is still appropriate?

We have added more detailed explanation in the methods section.

15) Please provide detailed information of the carrageenan concentration of the solution during heating.

We have added more detailed information about carrageenan analysis process.

16) Since the extraction method used for yield measurement seems were originated from national standard, please give brief explanation of the process. Since the standard may differ from the international standard.

We have added more detailed information about the extraction method and explained the process.

17) For solar drying method, it is common for authors to provide not only the hourly evolution of temperature and relative humidity, but also hourly evolution of solar radiation during drying process in W/m². However, the data of hourly evolution of solar radiation is missing. Please add accordingly to Figure 1 and Figure 2.

We have added information in the results and discussion section.

18) The legend of Figure 1 and Figure 2 are the same namely "direct sun drying". Please explain why the temperature and RH data with solar dryer and direct drying under the sun have the same data. Did you enter the wrong figure?

We have fixed and added the correct image.

19) The authors must explain explicitly on how the product was stored from preventing moisture content absorption into the product during drying pause at night.

We have added information in the materials and methods section.

20) Why the drying experiment only conducted for two days with 19 hours in total? Has the equilibrium moisture content been achieved? Is it any theoretical or practical consideration for the drying duration?

We have added information in the materials and methods section.

21) As per manuscript, the final moisture contents were 12.066% (db), 16.066% (db), and 13.643% (db) for tarpaulin, bamboo shelf, and solar dryer. However, in page 13 line 2-3, the authors stated that the lowest final moisture content was produced by solar dryer. Please correct accordingly.

We have fixed in article.

22) Please check the units of drying rate because the authors write different units in Table 2 (%/hour) and Figure 4 (%db/h).

We have fixed and added the units of drying rate correctly.

23) In Statistical Analysis sub-section, the authors considered five statistical parameters to obtain the fittest model, namely R², χ^2 , RMSE, SSE, and EF. However, in Results and Discussion section, only two of five statistical parameters used (Table 3). All considered statistical parameters should available in Table 3. Please give proper argument or correct accordingly.

We have added and completed the statistical parameters in Table 3.

- 24) What is 'Metode Pengeringan' on the header of second column of Table 3?
We have fixed in article.
- 25) The authors should explain more about the result of L^* , a^* , b^* on chromatization diagram to know how the changes of each color values (L^* , a^* , b^*) affects the color change of the dried E. Cottonii.
We have added more detailed explanation in article.
- 26) The images of dried samples from each drying method must be provided.
We have added the images of dried sample for each drying method.
- 27) Not all reference mentioned in text are available in reference list, e.g. Wang et al. (2011).
We have added and completed more references.
- 28) Please consider to use English-language reference. The journal is intended for broader potential international reader, hence reputable reference is a must. Please read 'Guide for Authors' for further details regarding non English-language reference.
We have added it in article.

Reviewer: 4

Comments to the Author

Seaweeds drying is an interesting topic, but results obtained under only one experimental condition (employing different methods underexplained without many necessary details to reproduce the experiments). Using solar drying, obviously, non-isothermal conditions are present during experiments and modelling is considered isothermal. There are some papers about modelling under non-isothermal conditions. To obtain water diffusivities under these conditions has no physical sense. To neglect the shrinkage of samples is not justified.

We have fixed and added more detailed explanation in article.

The product "quality" is not-well measured and discussed. Gel strengths depend on carrageenan content. To select better drying conditions, gels must be formulated with the same carrageenan content to detect possible depolymerization or other structural changes. Additionally, initial carrageenan content in fresh seaweeds must be the same. Differences observed could be mainly given by additional resistances or chemical link between carrageenan-compounds promoted by temperature during drying that hind the carrageenan extraction in dried product.

We have added information in article.

Additional comments

- 1) English is poor. Many repetitions in the manuscript.
We have fixed it in article.
- 2) Introduction is not well-written. Better, it is necessary to discuss recent papers about seaweeds drying.
We have fixed and added detailed information in article.
- 3) The number of Figures is also excessive and some of them are superfluous (some of them erroneous).
We have fixed some typos and added the correct information.
- 4) The use of a lot of empirical models to fit drying kinetics has little interest.

We have added more explanations about the mathematical model of thin layer drying used.

Reviewer: 5

Comments to the Author

Dear editor,

The study is a basic drying and thin layer modeling study. The discussion can be strengthened. The originality of the work should be emphasized.

Specific comments

- 1) P2 L 13-14 Abstract -- , carrageenan content (t) is missing.
We have fixed some typos.
- 2) Abstract- Temperature, RH, drying rate, moisture content, moisture ratio, effective moisture diffusivity, carrageenan content, gel strength, and color were measured. Some of them can be measured but some of them can be calculated.
We have added more explanations in abstract section.
- 3) Numerical data may be given in the abstract.
We have added more explanations in abstract section.
- 4) Materials and Methods - latitude and longitude information should be given.
We have added more detailed information about drying location point.
- 5) Fresh *E. cottonii* was spread thinly on .. please mention thickness.
We have added it in article.
- 6) The models and brands of all used equipments have to be given.
We have added more detailed information in the materials and methods section.
- 7) Please mention assumptions.
We have added it in article.
- 8) Please mention drying area.
We have added it in article.
- 9) Please mention repetition.
We have added it in article.
- 10) The statistical findings have to be mentioned in the text such as ($p < 0.05$).
We have added the statistical findings in the results and discussion section.
- 11) Table 5- 50,365 or 50.365?
We have fixed some typos.
- 12) Total color change may be calculated.
We have added more detailed explanation about color analysis.
- 13) Figures- Error bars are missing.
We have added it in article.
- 14) Conclusion- suggestion may be given for further studies.
We have added it in article.

Decision Letter (JFPP-07-21-1826.R1)

From: anet.rezek.jambrak@pbf.hr

To: jamaluddin6702@unm.ac.id, mamal_ptm@yahoo.co.id

CC: jamaluddin6702@unm.ac.id, mamal_ptm@yahoo.co.id, m.yahya@unm.ac.id, reski.febiyanti@unm.ac.id, andi.alamsyah@unm.ac.id

Subject: Journal of Food Processing and Preservation - Decision on Manuscript ID JFPP-07-21-1826.R1

Body: 30-Oct-2021

Dear Dr. Jamaluddin:

We recognise that the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic may affect your ability to return your revised manuscript to us within the requested timeframe. If this is the case, please let us know.

Manuscript ID JFPP-07-21-1826.R1 entitled "Drying kinetics and quality characteristics of *Eucheuma cottonii* in various drying methods" which you submitted to the Journal of Food Processing and Preservation, has been reviewed. The comments of the reviewer(s) are included at the bottom of this letter.

The reviewer(s) have recommended minor revisions to your manuscript. Therefore, I invite you to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise your manuscript.

To revise your manuscript, log into <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/jfpp> and enter your Author Center, where you will find your manuscript title listed under "Manuscripts with Decisions." Under "Actions," click on "Create a Revision." Your manuscript number has been appended to denote a revision.

You will be unable to make your revisions on the originally submitted version of the manuscript. Instead, revise your manuscript using a word processing program and save it on your computer. Please also highlight the changes to your manuscript within the document by using the track changes mode in MS Word or by using bold or colored text.

Unique & Verifiable Author Emails

To ensure that all authors and co-authors have a unique account in Journal of Food Processing and Preservation and that their account has a valid email address, the editors now request that every author account has an institutional email address when the revised manuscript is resubmitted. All authors and co-authors should

- log into their accounts at <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/jfpp>
- access their account details by clicking on the drop-down menu where their name appears in the toolbar
- click on the 'Email/Name' tab.
- input their institutional address in either 'Primary E-Mail Address' or 'Primary Cc E-Mail Address'.

Where authors or co-authors do not have an institutional email address they should include an explanation in the Author Cover letter along with any links to websites which can be used to verify the email address such as a University website, Research organization site, etc.

Once the revised manuscript is prepared, you can upload it and submit it through your Author Center. Please be sure to format your revised manuscript according to the journal guidelines for authors at <https://ifst.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/hub/journal/17454549/homepage/forauthors.html>.

When submitting your revised manuscript, you will be able to respond to the comments made by the reviewer(s) in the space provided. You can use this space to document any changes you make to the original manuscript. In order to expedite the processing of the revised manuscript, please be as specific as possible in your response to the reviewer(s).

IMPORTANT: Your original files are available to you when you upload your revised manuscript. Please delete any redundant files before completing the submission.

This journal offers a number of license options, information about this is available here: <https://authorservices.wiley.com/author-resources/Journal-Authors/licensing/index.html>. All co-authors are required to confirm that they have the necessary rights to grant in the submission, including in light of each co-author's funder policies. For example, if you or one of your co-authors received funding from a member of Coalition S, you may need to check which licenses you are able to sign.

Author Contribution Indication

The contributions of each author to this work must now be indicated when you submit your revised manuscript. To add Author Contributions using CRediT taxonomy (<http://credit.niso.org/contributor-roles-defined/>), simply click the "Provide CRediT Contribution" link for each author in the 'Authors & Institutions' step of the submission process. From there, you will be able to check applicable Author/Contributor Roles and, if available, specify the Degree of Contribution. You MUST provide this information as part of the revision process. Author Contributions will be published with the accepted article and cannot be edited after article acceptance. Therefore you must ensure the Author Contribution information you provide is accurate prior to final acceptance.

Because we are trying to facilitate timely publication of manuscripts submitted to the Journal of Food Processing and Preservation, your revised manuscript should be uploaded as soon as possible. If it is not possible for you to submit your revision in a reasonable amount of time, we may have to consider your paper as a new submission.

Once again, thank you for submitting your manuscript to the Journal of Food Processing and Preservation and I look forward to receiving your revision.

Sincerely,
Prof. Anet Rezek Jambrak

Associate Editor Comments to Author
Associate Editor: Rezek Jambrak, Anet
Comments to Author:
(There are no comments.)

Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:
Reviewer: 1

Comments to the Author
The authors has substantially improved on the manuscript from the last one submitted.

However, Page 30-31: This reference should be corrected from the reference list

Salarikia, A., Miraei Ashtiani, S. H., Golzarian, M. R., George, C., Mogil, Q., Andrews, M., Ewing, G., Jha, P., Meghwal, M., Prabhakar, P. K., Junqueira, J. R. de J., Corrêa, J. L. G., Ernesto, D. B., Kaveh, M., Abbaspour-Gilandeh, Y., Fatemi, H., Chen, G., Oladejo, A. O., Ekpene, M. A. M., ... Shi, W. (2021). Comparison of Drying Characteristics and Quality of Peppermint Leaves Using Different Drying Methods. *Journal of Food Processing and Preservation*, 45(3), 1-13.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/jfpp.12930>

Reviewer: 5

Comments to the Author
The authors corrected this paper properly taken under considerations all my comments. Therefore, I can accept it now.

Date Sent: 30-Oct-2021

We have corrected the incorrect reference and changed the reference used to

Kasara, A., Babar, O. A., Tarafdar, A., Senthilkumar, T., Sirohi, R., & Arora, V. K. (2021).

Thin-layer drying of sadabahar (*Catharanthus roseus*) leaves using different drying techniques and fate of bioactive compounds. *Journal of Food Processing and Preservation*, 45(2), e15140. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jfpp.15140>

Aside from that, we have made some corrections to the texts in other references.

Additionally, we conducted the proofreading again to our manuscript.

Journal of Food Processing and Preservation - Decision on Manuscript ID JFPP-07-21-1826.R2

1 pesan

Anet Rezek Jambrak <onbehalf@manuscriptcentral.com>

19 November 2021 03.58

Balas Ke: anet.rezek.jambrak@pbf.hr

Kepada: jamaluddin6702@unm.ac.id, mamal_ptm@yahoo.co.id

Cc: jamaluddin6702@unm.ac.id, mamal_ptm@yahoo.co.id, m.yahya@unm.ac.id, reski.febyanti@unm.ac.id, andi.alamsyah@unm.ac.id

18-Nov-2021

Dear Dr. Jamaluddin:

We recognise that the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic may affect your ability to return your revised manuscript to us within the requested timeframe. If this is the case, please let us know.

Manuscript ID JFPP-07-21-1826.R2 entitled "Drying kinetics and quality characteristics of *Eucheuma cottonii* seaweed in various drying methods" which you submitted to the Journal of Food Processing and Preservation, has been reviewed. The comments of the reviewer(s) are included at the bottom of this letter.

The reviewer(s) have recommended some revisions to your manuscript. Therefore, I invite you to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise your manuscript.

To revise your manuscript, log into <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/jfpp> and enter your Author Center, where you will find your manuscript title listed under "Manuscripts with Decisions." Under "Actions," click on "Create a Revision." Your manuscript number has been appended to denote a revision.

You will be unable to make your revisions on the originally submitted version of the manuscript. Instead, revise your manuscript using a word processing program and save it on your computer. Please also highlight the changes to your manuscript within the document by using the track changes mode in MS Word or by using bold or colored text. Once the revised manuscript is prepared, you can upload it and submit it through your Author Center.

Unique & Verifiable Author Emails

To ensure that all authors and co-authors have a unique account in Journal of Food Processing and Preservation and that their account has a valid email address, the editors now request that every author account has an institutional email address when the revised manuscript is resubmitted. All authors and co-authors should

- log into their accounts at <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/jfpp>
- access their account details by clicking on the drop-down menu where their name appears in the toolbar
- click on the 'Email/Name' tab.
- input their institutional address in either 'Primary E-Mail Address' or 'Primary Cc E-Mail Address'.

Where authors or co-authors do not have an institutional email address they should include an explanation in the Author Cover letter along with any links to websites which can be used to verify the email address such as a University website, Research organization site, etc.

When submitting your revised manuscript, you will be able to respond to the comments made by the reviewer(s) in the space provided. You can use this space to document any changes you make to the original manuscript. In order to expedite the processing of the revised manuscript, please be as specific as possible in your response to the reviewer(s).

IMPORTANT: Your original files are available to you when you upload your revised manuscript. Please delete any redundant files before completing the submission. Please be sure to format your revised manuscript according to the journal guidelines for authors at <https://ifst.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/hub/journal/17454549/homepage/forauthors.html>.

Author Contribution Indication

The contributions of each author to this work must now be indicated when you submit your revised manuscript. To add Author Contributions using CRediT taxonomy (<http://credit.niso.org/contributor-roles-defined/>), simply click the "Provide CRediT Contribution" link for each author in the 'Authors & Institutions' step of the submission process. From there, you will be able to check applicable Author/Contributor Roles and, if available, specify the Degree of Contribution. You MUST provide this information as part of the revision process. Author Contributions will be published with the accepted article and cannot be edited after article acceptance. Therefore you must ensure the Author Contribution information you provide is accurate prior to final acceptance.

Because we are trying to facilitate timely publication of manuscripts submitted to the Journal of Food Processing and Preservation, your revised manuscript should be uploaded as soon as possible. If it is not possible for you to submit your revision in a reasonable amount of time, we may have to consider your paper as a new submission.

Wiley Editing Services Available to All Authors

Should you be interested, Wiley Editing Services offers expert help with manuscript, language, and format editing, along with other article preparation services. You can learn more about this service option at www.wileyauthors.com/eoo/preparation. You can also check out Wiley's collection of free article preparation resources for general guidance about writing and preparing your manuscript at www.wileyauthors.com/eoo/prepresources.

This journal offers a number of license options, information about this is available here: <https://authorservices.wiley.com/author-resources/Journal-Authors/licensing/index.html>. All co-authors are required to confirm that they have the necessary rights to grant in the submission, including in light of each co-author's funder policies. For example, if you or one of your co-authors received funding from a member of Coalition S, you may need to check which licenses you are able to sign.

Once again, thank you for submitting your manuscript to the Journal of Food Processing and Preservation and I look forward to receiving your revision.

Sincerely,
Prof. Anet Rezek Jambrak

Associate Editor Comments to Author
Associate Editor: Rezek Jambrak, Anet
Comments to Author:
(There are no comments.)

Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:

Reviewer: 1

Comments to the Author
Accept

Reviewer: 6

Comments to the Author
accept

Reviewer: 2

Comments to the Author

The manuscript "Drying kinetics and quality characteristics of *Eucheuma cottonii* seaweed in various drying methods" seems improved now but the scientific base is still the same. Additionally, applied analysis are very common. If the drying method of the product is based on a single scientific fact, I think that more detailed analyzes should be made and these analysis results should be compared with scientific data in order to explain the differences between the final products. Not just only with color analysis or exact pictures.

P.S.: If these project includes much more details in several kinds of analysis (maybe the work has divided into parts and if it is intended to publish about only sun drying method), I believe it must be submitted with including the other drying methods basis.

-In Figure 12; Caption must be corrected as "methods", "s" must be added to the last word "Figure 12. Value of L*, a*, b*, and chromaticity diagram of *E. cottonii* on different drying methods"

-In Figure 13. "s" must be added to the last word again. "Figure 13. Dried *E. cottonii* from tarpaulin (a), bamboo shelf (b), and solar dryer (c) methods."

-In Figure 13; "Dried *E. cottonii* from tarpaulin (a), bamboo shelf (b), and solar dryer (c) Method" pictures look like each other and I do not think that the differences are seen clearly.

Comments to the Author

The manuscript “Drying kinetics and quality characteristics of *Eucheuma cottonii* seaweed in various drying methods” seems improved now but the scientific base is still the same. Additionally, applied analysis are very common. If the drying method of the product is based on a single scientific fact, I think that more detailed analyzes should be made and these analysis results should be compared with scientific data in order to explain the differences between the final products. Not just only with color analysis or exact pictures.

P.S.: If these project includes much more details in several kinds of analysis (maybe the work has divided into parts and if it is intended to publish about only sun drying method), I believe it must be submitted with including the other drying methods basis.

We have described the differences between the drying methods used in this study.

In addition to comparing the characteristics of seaweed, we also compared the drying kinetics of the three drying methods, with various mathematical models applied. This is significant information in our study because there is no reference that combines the analysis of drying kinetics and quality characteristics of dried seaweed with various drying methods.

In addition to color analysis, we also used analysis of carrageenan content and gel strength in this study. These two analyses have become the standard of analysis in the industry that can determine the quality of dried seaweed. We have added explanations and some references in this regard.

We have explained the addition of other drying methods and other seaweed quality analysis for further study.

-In Figure 12; Caption must be corrected as “methods”, “s” must be added to the last word “Figure 12. Value of L^* , a^* , b^* , and chromaticity diagram of *E. cottonii* on different drying methods”

We have added “s” to the caption of Figure 12

-In Figure 13. “s” must be added to the last word again. “Figure 13. Dried *E. cottonii* from tarpaulin (a), bamboo shelf (b), and solar dryer (c) methods.”

We have added “s” to the caption of Figure 13

-In Figure 13; “Dried *E. cottonii* from tarpaulin (a), bamboo shelf (b), and solar dryer (c) Method” pictures look like each other and I do not think that the differences are seen clearly.

We have replaced the Figure 13

Journal of Food Processing and Preservation - Decision on Manuscript ID JFPP-07-21-1826.R3

Brijesh Tiwari <onbehalf@manuscriptcentral.com>

12 Desember 2021 21.23

Balas Ke: Brijesh.Tiwari@teagasc.ie

Kepada: jamaluddin6702@unm.ac.id, mamal_ptm@yahoo.co.id, m.yahya@unm.ac.id, reski.febyanti@unm.ac.id, andi.alamsyah@unm.ac.id

Cc: jamaluddin6702@unm.ac.id, mamal_ptm@yahoo.co.id, m.yahya@unm.ac.id, reski.febyanti@unm.ac.id, andi.alamsyah@unm.ac.id

12-Dec-2021

Dear Dr. Jamaluddin:

It is a pleasure to accept your manuscript entitled "Drying kinetics and quality characteristics of *Eucheuma cottonii* seaweed in various drying methods" in its current form for publication in the Journal of Food Processing and Preservation.

Your article cannot be published until the corresponding author has signed the appropriate license agreement. Within the next few days the corresponding author will receive an email from Wiley's Author Services system which will ask them to log in and will present them with the appropriate licence for completion.

This journal offers a number of license options, information about this is available here: <https://authorservices.wiley.com/author-resources/Journal-Authors/licensing/index.html>. All co-authors are required to confirm that they have the necessary rights to grant in the submission, including in light of each co-author's funder policies. For example, if you or one of your co-authors received funding from a member of Coalition S, you may need to check which licenses you are able to sign.

Thank you for your fine contribution. On behalf of the Editors of the Journal of Food Processing and Preservation, we look forward to your continued contributions to the Journal.

Sincerely,

Associate Editor Comments to Author
Associate Editor: Rezek Jambrak, Anet
Comments to Author:
(There are no comments.)

Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:

P.S. – You can help your research get the attention it deserves! Wiley Editing Services offers professional video abstract and infographic creation to help you promote your research at www.wileyauthors.com/eoo/promotion. And, check out Wiley's free Promotion Guide for best-practice recommendations for promoting your work at www.wileyauthors.com/eoo/guide.

This journal accepts artwork submissions for Cover Images. This is an optional service you can use to help increase article exposure and showcase your research. For more information, including artwork guidelines, pricing, and submission details, please visit the Journal Cover Image page at www.wileyauthors.com/eoo/covers.

Published: Your article is now published online!

Eksternal

Kotak Masuk x



cs-author@wiley.com

kepada saya ▾

12.14 (4 menit yang lalu)



Dear Jamaluddin Jamaluddin,

Your article Drying kinetics and quality characteristics of Eucheuma cottonii seaweed in various drying methods in Journal of Food Processing and Preservation has the following publication status: Published Online

To access and share your article, please click the following link to register or log in:

<https://authorservices.wiley.com/index.html#register>

You can also access your published article via this link: <http://doi.org/10.1111/jfpp.16258>

If you need any assistance, please click [here](#) to view our Help section.

Sincerely,

Wiley Author Services