

Review of: "Acacia Pycnantha Gum Exudates Recognised As a Traditional Food in Two Countries May Have Economic Potential"

Matheus Poletto¹

¹ Universidade de Caxias do Sul (UCS)

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear Editor

Thank you very much for giving me the possibility to contribute to the quality of this work. I found this study interesting. However, in my opinion, the manuscript needs to be deeply improved. The main structure of the article needs to be improved. Some suggestions are described below.

Title: The title is too general and does not reflect the main objective of this work.

Introduction: I suggest clarifying the novelty of this work.

Materials and Methods: Please specify the location from where the AP gum was collected and also add the date of collection. In my opinion, both sentences need to be added to the introduction: "Approximately 40% of trees had gum, with ≈1% of trees, usually mature trees, having significant amounts, while ≈60% of trees, mostly younger trees, had little or no gum. Seasonal conditions, rainfall, and location are likely to influence gum production."

I also think that the second and third paragraphs need to be moved to the introduction section.

Results and discussion: Try to clarify this section. Some suggestions are described below:

- 1) Why does the author compare the price of GA with the price of AP gums in 1836?
- 2) Please add the values related to the "cost of labour" and better discuss this result.

Conclusion: Please be more specific about the conclusions of this work.