

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFRN_118255
Title of the Manuscript:	Anticancer, Anti-inflammatory, and Antioxidant Activity of Protein-bound and Protein-free Polysaccharide Isolated from Pleurotus ostreatus
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://journalajfrn.com/index.php/AJFRN/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for the scientific community? (Please write a few sentences on this manuscript)</p>	<p>The manuscript has the potential to be important for the scientific community based on the excerpt you provided. Here's why: The research appears to be investigating the comparative effects of protein-bound and protein-free polysaccharides extracted from oyster mushrooms. If PfPOP shows stronger biological activities (antioxidant, anticancer, anti-inflammatory) compared to PbPOP, it suggests a new avenue for therapeutic development. The work explores the potential reasons behind the difference in activity by analysing protein content. This can contribute to the understanding of how these polysaccharides work. However, to definitively determine the manuscript's importance for the scientific community.</p>	
<p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the article, "Anticancer, Anti-inflammatory, and Antioxidant Activity of Protein-bound and Protein-free Polysaccharide Isolated from Pleurotus ostreatus", is suitable but could be improved for better clarity and conciseness. Here's why:</p> <p>While the title mentions the key components (antioxidant, anti-inflammatory, anticancer) and the source (Pleurotus ostreatus), it doesn't explicitly state the crucial comparison between protein-bound and protein-free forms. Here are some suggestions for alternative titles that are more informative:</p> <p>"Comparative Anticancer, Anti-inflammatory, and Antioxidant Activities of Protein-Bound and Protein-Free Polysaccharides from Pleurotus ostreatus" "Superior Anticancer, Anti-inflammatory, and Antioxidant Activities of Protein-Free Polysaccharides Isolated from Pleurotus ostreatus" (if the study highlights PfPOP's advantages)</p>	
<p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p>	<p>Based on the manuscript you provided and the criteria for a good abstract, the abstract seems comprehensive</p>	
<p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The structure of the manuscript with subsections likely follows the standard format for</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	scientific articles, which is generally considered appropriate. This structure facilitates a logical flow of information. It starts with the big picture (introduction), delves into the specifics (methods and results), interprets the outcomes (discussion and conclusion), and credits the sources (references).	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	Yes	
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	<p>Based on the information you've provided, the references appear sufficient and recent for the research topic.</p> <p>All the references deal with the biological activities (antioxidant, anticancer, anti-inflammatory) of polysaccharides, particularly from mushrooms. This directly aligns with the core theme of the research on Pleurotus ostreatus polysaccharides. The list includes recent publications (2015-2021) showcasing current knowledge in the field. It also incorporates foundational works (1990s) that established methodologies for evaluating these activities. This demonstrates a well-rounded understanding of the research area. The references seem to originate from reputable sources like peer-reviewed journals, established scientific databases, and book chapters from recognized publishers.</p> <p>Overall, the reference list strengthens the manuscript by anchoring the research in existing knowledge and methodologies.</p> <p>There appears to be a duplicate reference for Li et al. (2015) with reference number 8 repeating information from reference number 3. You can remove one of these entries. Some references pertain to methods for evaluating antioxidant activity, protein determination, and cytotoxicity assays. These likely correspond to the methodology section of the manuscript and demonstrate strong methodological grounding if appropriately cited within the text. Add some references from 2021- 2024.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>The language/English quality of the passage you provided is likely suitable for scholarly communications.</p> <p>The manuscript uses scientific terms like "antioxidant," "anti-inflammatory," "cytotoxicity," and "COX enzymes," indicating a grasp of the scientific field. The sentences are grammatically correct and well-structured, conveying information. Overall, the excerpt suggests the language is likely appropriate for scholarly communication</p>	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sanyogita Shahi
Department, University &Country	Kalinga University, India