

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_124057
Title of the Manuscript:	Potential benefits of tannins on ruminant health, production and environmental sustainability: A review
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>Tannins and other anti-nutritional factors have always been looked at from their adverse effects perspective. Little is known about their beneficial effects. This paradigm shift of seriously focussing on their beneficial effects broadens nutritional knowledge in livestock production particularly ruminant species. This review highlights commercial harvesting and utilisation of plant secondary compounds, a practice that will in future broaden feed additives for improved performance of farm animals. Additionally the knowledge in this paper will influence pasture management by incorporating plant species that will supply tannins to both confined and free-grazing farm animals. Furthermore the manuscript brings out the salient role of sustainability in livestock feeding strategies given the current climate change and climate variability. The chemical property of tannins binding with proteins and hence reducing methane production is cardinal in mitigating global warming.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the article is suitable because it contains all key words.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract is succinct and detailed enough given the fact that the manuscript is a review.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript is well structured with clear subsections accompanied by relevant content.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>Given the fact that tannins belong to a wider group of compounds called anti-nutritional factors in nutrition science, the manuscript has moved away from addressing what most researches have focussed on (i.e feed quality reduction) to bringing out the positive aspect of tannins. The manuscript has addressed the relationship of plant genetics, environmental and ecological factors. The content therein will enhance the promotion of microbes in the rumen of ruminants. Additionally the antibiotic properties will offer natural alternative to animal health by replacing conventional drugs with tannins. This will have both health and economic benefits.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>References are very adequate, sufficient and relevant. References as soon as 2024 have been included reflecting the seriousness of the author.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Both grammar and scientific language are of high quality. The language quality is very suitable for a scholarly paper.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This is a high quality manuscript revealing the positive nature of what has been viewed as being toxic for a long time.</p>	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Donald M. Chisowa
Department, University & Country	Southern University, Zambia