

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJBGMB_127917
Title of the Manuscript:	In-vitro comparative antioxidant effects and proximate composition of peeled and unpeeled pigeon-pea (<i>Cajanus cajan</i>) Seedlings
Type of the Article	Research article

PART 1: 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>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript provides valuable insights into the nutritional and phytochemical properties of pigeon pea flours, emphasizing the impact of processing methods on their antioxidant capacities and bioactive compounds. By systematically comparing proximate compositions, phenolic and flavonoid contents, and antioxidant activities, it offers a comprehensive understanding of the potential health benefits of processed and unprocessed pigeon pea products. These findings contribute to the growing body of research on functional foods and their role in combating oxidative stress-related diseases. Furthermore, the study highlights the importance of optimizing food processing techniques to preserve and enhance nutritional value, serving as a reference for both researchers and the food industry.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Here's a suggestion for an alternative title: "Impact of Processing on the Nutritional and Antioxidant Properties of Pigeon Pea (<i>Cajanus cajan</i>) Flours: A Comparative Study" This title highlights the study's focus on processing methods, their effect on nutritional and antioxidant properties, and the comparative nature of the analysis between processed and unprocessed pigeon pea flours.	
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.	The abstract of the article can be improved to ensure it comprehensively conveys the study's significance, methods, key findings, and implications. While it provides a general overview, adding a brief background on the nutritional and processing importance of pigeon pea (<i>Cajanus cajan</i>) would strengthen its context. Including specific methodologies, such as the proximate composition analysis and antioxidant assays, would enhance clarity. Additionally, incorporating quantitative findings, such as differences in nutrient retention and antioxidant activity between processed and unprocessed flours, would make the results more impactful. The conclusion should explicitly link these findings to their broader implications for food science and processing techniques, emphasizing the potential benefits of optimizing processing methods. Overall, these additions would make the abstract more precise, informative, and aligned with the study's goals.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the manuscript appears scientifically correct based on the methods, data, and conclusions presented.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are generally sufficient and include a mix of relevant and recent studies. However, adding a few more recent articles (especially from 2022-2024) on related antioxidant and anti-inflammatory properties of plant extracts could strengthen the manuscript further. Consider including references that focus on the molecular mechanisms of antioxidants or recent findings on <i>Cajanus cajan</i> and related legume species.	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Be consistent with terms used throughout the article. For instance, always refer to "PPP" and "UPP" in the same way (e.g., "PPP extract" and "UPP extract"). Repeating the same idea in different ways can make the text more cumbersome. For example, instead of repeatedly saying "significantly different," you can combine sentences to convey the same meaning more concisely. Ensure appropriate punctuation and the correct use of articles (a, an, the).	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	- Based on the review, I would give the manuscript an overall mark of 8.5	

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:	Rajesh Rokkam
Department, University & Country	Andhra University, India