

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_115513
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimization of Pre-treatment Parameters on the Protein Content of the Liquid Extract of Sweet Potato (var. VitAto) for Developing a Plant-based Beverage Intended as a Milk Alternative.
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

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 scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. This work focuses on optimising pre-treatment parameters to increase the protein content of sweet potato extracts for the manufacturing of plant-based beverages, a topic that is becoming more and more significant in the scientific community. Providing a wholesome and sustainable substitute for dairy milk is in line with dietary preferences and environmental awareness. This means that the research has implications for both industry and academia.</p> <p>2. There is no need for amendment because the title clearly reflects the subject matter, methodology, and intended application of the study while also successfully conveying the focus and scope of the research.</p> <p>3. An overview of the main conclusions, methods, research objectives, and implications is given in brief in the abstract. It helps readers comprehend the main points of the manuscript by succinctly summarising the importance and findings of the study. There is no need to make any changes to the abstract.</p> <p>4. The work is organised logically, with distinct subsections that make it easier to read and understand. The smooth transition between each segment and the next guarantees coherence and cohesiveness throughout the work. Readers are suitably guided through the study process by the structure, which covers everything from background data to methodology, findings, and conclusions. The structure and subsections don't need to be altered.</p> <p>5. The experimental design, data analysis, and interpretation in the publication exhibit a high degree of scientific rigour. Sound methodological and statistical studies back up the findings. Nonetheless, in order to improve the understanding of scientific concepts and procedures, a few minor clarifications could be required in some sections. Overall, the manuscript remains accurate from a scientific standpoint.</p> <p>6. The references included in the study offer sufficient backing for the research, encompassing pertinent material on protein extraction, plant-based beverages, and optimisation methodologies. Adding references that deal especially with the extraction of sweet potato protein and plant-based milk substitutes, however, could improve the paper even more. May be the following references can be useful</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Grace, M., Truong, A., Truong, V. D., Raskin, I., & Lila, M. (2015). Novel value-added uses for sweet potato juice and flour in polyphenol- and protein-enriched functional food ingredients. <i>Food Science & Nutrition</i>, 3. https://doi.org/10.1002/fsn3.234• Luo, D., Mu, T., Sun, H., & Chen, J. (2020). Optimization of the formula and processing of a sweet potato leaf powder-based beverage. <i>Food Science & Nutrition</i>, 8(6), 2680–2691. https://doi.org/10.1002/fsn3.1555• Moss, R., LeBlanc, J., Gorman, M., Ritchie, C., Duizer, L., & McSweeney, M. B. (2023). A Prospective Review of the Sensory Properties of Plant-Based Dairy and Meat Alternatives with a Focus on Texture. <i>Foods</i>, 12(8), 1709. https://doi.org/10.3390/foods12081709• P, V., Dash, S. K., & Rayaguru, K. (2019). Post-Harvest Processing and Utilization of Sweet Potato: A Review. <i>Food Reviews International</i>, 35(8), 726–762. https://doi.org/10.1080/87559129.2019.1600540	<p>1. The author is unable to identify which sections require clarification for improvement (Reviewer's Comment No. 5), as the reviewer did not specify them explicitly. Consequently, no corrections have been made. Additionally, the reviewer commented that the manuscript remains accurate from a scientific standpoint.</p> <p>2. The suggested references (Reviewer's Comment No. 6) were not added to the manuscript as their content is unrelated to the manuscript, and some overlap with the references already cited. Furthermore, the reviewer mentioned that the existing references were sufficient to support the research.</p>

Review Form 1.7

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Tachie, C., Nwachukwu, I. D., & Aryee, A. N. A. (2023). Trends and innovations in the formulation of plant-based foods. <i>Food Production, Processing and Nutrition</i>, 5(1), 16. https://doi.org/10.1186/s43014-023-00129-0	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The article's language and English quality are appropriate for academic discourse. The manuscript exhibits expert writing with few grammatical mistakes. Minor edits could be necessary, though, in some areas for coherence and clarity, especially when elaborating on difficult scientific ideas or experimental techniques	Minor edits have been made, as highlighted in yellow in the manuscript, for coherence and clarity.
Optional/General comments	Overall, the research offers insightful study results that could have an impact on both academics and business. The authors in response to the reviewers' insightful criticism will amend the text. Still, more editing for coherence and precision could improve the manuscript's quality even more.	The text has been edited and amended according to the reviewer's comments to improve the quality of the manuscript.

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	