

Peer Review

Review of: "Colocation of Seaweed Aquaculture at Offshore Windfarms: Policy Opportunities and Barriers in the UK"

Shambhu Sajith¹

1. University of Petroleum and Energy Studies, Dehra Dūn, India

The needs revision on novelty and contribution to existing literature. The need for the study is not specified.

Who benefits from this study?

What is the methodology? How did the authors decide which study to review?

Mention the materials and methods used in the study. The study lists down a large part of RE tech with seaweeds but did not touch upon any of the previous studies that involved other co-location strategies and their revenue streams.

The recommendations look quite general and some are in practice; revisit and add novelty, and justify why they should be prioritised.

There is not much visual representation, graphical abstract, or any pictures that readers would benefit from in understanding the arguments.

Previous studies are not compared, and the discussion needs a revisit; it should be enhanced through state-of-the-art literature.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.