

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFRN_124369
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Comparative in-vitro Analyses of the Anti-Inflammatory, Antioxidant, and Antimicrobial Properties of Selected Soup Thickeners commonly used in the Niger Delta Region of Nigeria.</b>
Type of the Article	

## Review Form 3

### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> 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><b>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.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript provides valuable insights into the comparative bioactivity of traditional soup thickeners (<i>Mucuna sloanei</i>, <i>Brachystegia eurycoma</i>, and <i>Brachystegia nigerica</i>) commonly used in the Niger Delta region of Nigeria. It addresses the potential medicinal uses of these thickeners by examining their anti-inflammatory, antioxidant, and antimicrobial properties. The study is important for the scientific community as it bridges the gap between traditional knowledge and scientific validation, suggesting that these natural thickeners could be further explored for therapeutic development. I appreciate the manuscript's relevance to ethnobotanical research, especially in exploring cost-effective, natural alternatives for health applications. However, more in-depth analysis of the mechanisms involved would enhance its scientific robustness.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>The title, "Comparative in-vitro Analyses of the Anti-Inflammatory Antioxidant and Antimicrobial Properties of Selected Soup Thickeners commonly used in the Niger Delta Region of Nigeria", is mostly suitable, as it accurately reflects the content of the study. However, it could be shortened for clarity and impact. A suggestion would be: "Comparative Bioactivity of Niger Delta Soup Thickeners: Anti-Inflammatory, Antioxidant, and Antimicrobial Properties".</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The abstract is comprehensive and provides a clear overview of the study's objectives, methods, and key findings. However, it would benefit from mentioning the specific assays used in the antioxidant, anti-inflammatory, and antimicrobial tests. Including this information would provide a clearer picture for readers unfamiliar with the full content. No major deletions are needed, but brief details about the methodology would strengthen it.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>The manuscript is well-structured with appropriate subsections that guide the reader through the study's methods, results, and discussion. The flow between the phytochemical screening, bioactivity assays, and comparative analyses is logical and easy to follow.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The manuscript appears scientifically sound, with well-executed in-vitro analyses that follow established protocols for bioactivity assays. The data presented is consistent with previous research on plant-based antioxidants and antimicrobials, particularly in relation to <i>Mucuna sloanei</i>. The findings are robust, given that multiple methods were used to evaluate the bioactive properties of the plants. The results are statistically validated and provide a strong foundation for future research. However, more in-depth discussion of the bioactive mechanisms would enhance the manuscript's technical strength.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> :</p>	<p>The references used are sufficient and include recent studies related to the subject matter. However, additional references to more global research on traditional medicine and plant-based antioxidants might further contextualize the findings. I recommend adding recent studies on the global use of phytochemicals and antioxidants, particularly those published in the last two years.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p><b>Language Quality:</b> The language is mostly clear and suitable for scholarly communication, but there are some minor grammatical issues, such as inconsistent use of tenses and missing punctuation, which could be improved. A professional proofreading would enhance readability.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript could benefit from the inclusion of some graphical abstracts or visual aids, such as diagrams or charts, to make the comparative analyses more accessible. This would improve the manuscript's appeal to a broader audience, including those less familiar with the technical details of in-vitro assays.</p>	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Omkar S Kamble</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>India</b>