



SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The authors have not properly addressed to the valuable comments of the reviewers 2. The paper still lacks of scientific merit in many aspects, from methodology to results presentation and discussion. 	<p>I believe we wasted enough time with this manuscript which has been revised twice before.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The comments of the reviewers are advisory and meant to improve the quality of the manuscript and maintain the quality and standard of any journal. 2. The comment can be contradictory and based on individual style or preference and it is the choice of the author to agree or disagree with some or all the comments, as the case in this paper. 3. In a case of disagreement between the author and the reviewers, it is the responsibly of the Editor-in Chief to decide for the best interest of the journal. Unfortunately, this was not the case. All what I received from the Editor are these comments: The authors have not properly addressed to the valuable comments of the reviewers and The paper still lacks of scientific merit in many aspects, from methodology to results presentation and discussion. <p>The paper has been revised for the third time from the abstract and introduction to the methodology, results and discussion where appropriate. I still disagree</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. With the removal (or inclusion in Appendix) of five sensory evaluation sheets. These sheets have the definition of the sensory parameters and information on how the test was carried out which is beneficial for the readership. 2. Tables 13-18 health information about the various compounds found in spirulina which are within the scope of the paper and of great benefits the readership.