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| PART 1: Comments |
|  | Reviewer’s comment**Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | Author’s Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **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.** |  **Creating a manuscript itself is already a big help to the scientific community. This type of manuscript that tackles ethnobotany, modern nutritional science, and the potential of antioxidants is already on a different level regarding the contribution, each of which further solidifies why it should be published. This manuscript not only tackles ethnobotany and modern nutritional science, but also bridges them, making way for more papers like this to be conducted in the future. Furthermore, this type of manuscript contributes to the Sustainable Development Goals, most notably under SDG 3 - Good health and well-being, further solidifying its contribution to the scientific community and future goals globally. In conclusion, a manuscript that tackles the past usage of available plants within the researcher’s area and reincorporates them into modern nutritional science can significantly contribute to the scientific realm. And with this research soon being published, hopefully, it will ignite other researchers to produce a similar concept of manuscript, serving as a beacon of inspiration for others to create an impactful manuscript.** |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?****(If not please suggest an alternative title)** |  **Yes, it is very suitable, perfectly encapsulating the manuscript’s objectives. And also, through the title itself, you can already guess what this manuscript will be about.** |  |
| 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. |  **Remove the indicators of the part of the abstract (Background, Objectives, Methodology, Results, discussion and Conclusion), instead, write it in a paragraph form, preferably into three paragraphs (1ST paragraph for background, objectives can go either the 1st or 2nd paragraph, methodologies should be on the 2nd paragraph, and Results, discussion, and conclusion should be on the 3rd paragraph), that uses understandable transitional words to indicate that you are transiotioning from one paragraph to the other for a more comprehensive abstact.** **The reviewer also suggests a different distribution when it comes to your abstract. 15% should be allocated for the background, another 15% should be for the objectives, 30% should be allocated for methodologies, and the remaining 40% should be allocated for the results, discussions, and conclusion part. Overall, the abstract's construction is commendable and just needs minor revisions.** |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.**  |  **Overall, this manuscript is scientifically correct as it exhibited a structured abstract and title, utilized established research methods like sample preparation, used scientific terminology correctly, showcased a clear research problem that aims to explore ethnobotany in their area, and incorporated it for today's modern nutritional sciences—accurate, scientifically presented the results. Hence, the reviewer noticed some areas of concern that need to be revised.**  **First is the lack of statistical treatment. This is an important part of the methods as it determines the reliability and significance of the result correctly. Second, it lacks standard protocols for extract preparation and phytochemical analysis, which were only introduced at a surface level without clearly explaining the procedure. Third is the inconsistency of crucial units, especially if others want to replicate the methods used. Last is the overstatement in the conclusion, as it may be misleading about the benefits of this manuscript--claiming it without in vivo studies, clinical data, and toxicity assessments.** **Overall, the reviewer commends the researchers for making this manuscript scientifically correct. Hence, revisions are needed to make it more scientifically accurate.** |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.****-** |  **Some references are not up to date. The reviewer suggests finding more recent literature or studies to support your manuscript. The standard range of publication years of studies/literature you can use for your paper is 5 years. The references used are commendable and sufficient to back up and serve as the backbone of the manuscript.** |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? |  **The quality of the language used is commendable and is very suitable both for scholarly communications and for the people that will read this manuscript—doesn’t use words that are too deep that raise confusion. Construction of the manuscript, from words, sentences, and paragraphs, shows a quality of the language used.** |  |
| Optional/General comments | 1. **Use the given citation style when citing your references, whether in-text or on the reference list.**
2. **Includes pictures that can be included for the improvement of the manuscript, and attach them as appendices.**
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