Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_115513
	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	

Created by: DR Checked by: PM Approved by: MBM Version: 1.7 (15-12-2022)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
 Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 	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.	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	 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. 	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	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.	
(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	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.	
	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.	
	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	
	 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. Food Science & Nutrition, 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. Food Science & Nutrition, 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. Foods, 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. Food Reviews International, 35(8), 726–762. https://doi.org/10.1080/87559129.2019.1600540 	

Created by: DR Checked by: PM Approved by: MBM Version: 1.7 (15-12-2022)

Review Form 1.7

	Tachie, C., Nwachukwu, I. D., & Aryee, A. N. A. (2023). Trends and innovations in the formulation of plant-based foods. Food Production, Processing and Nutrition, 5(1), 16. https://doi.org/10.1186/s43014-023-00129-0	
Minor REVISION comments		
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	
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.	

PART 2:

		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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nyiranshuti Angelique
Department, University & Country	Dedan Kimathi University of Science and Technology, Jaramogi Oginga Odinga University of Science and Technology, Kenya

Created by: DR Checked by: PM Approved by: MBM Version: 1.7 (15-12-2022)