

Review of: "Uncovering Insights Into the Bio-Efficiency of Zingiber Officinale Roscoe: Understanding Components That Contribute Significantly to Ginger's Anti-inflammatory and Antioxidant Potential in Relationship With Modern Drying Methods"

Ty Pham¹

1 Hue University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Comments to authors:

- 1. The title should be shortened for better clarity and conciseness.
- 2. Please rewrite the paragraph discussing the findings reported by Mutukiri et al. on page 2/29 for better clarity and coherence.
- 3. Could you please provide rationale for choosing 50°C for 30 minutes and centrifugation at 4000 r.p.m for 15 minutes for the preparation of extracts? This information is on page 3/29.
- 4. Why did the authors choose the DPPH model to determine the free radical scavenging activity of the compounds from the extracts? This information is on page 3/29.
- 5. Typically, GC-MS analysis is conducted on volatile components such as essential oils or easily volatile compounds. However, you analyzed the GC-MS of the extracts obtained from materials soaked with a methanol/water solvent system (80/20, v/v). What standard compound series did you use for the GC-MS analysis of the extract samples? This is discussed on page 4/29.
- 6. Could you please provide the detector model of the Agilent 6890N analysis machine? Also, provide the brand of the chromatographic column with a film thickness of 0.15 micrometers and dimensions of 30m x 0.25mm ID. Additionally, provide the name of the library data for the Agilent 6890N machine. This information is on page 4/29.
- 7. From the GC-MS results table (Supplementary Data 1), why are characteristic compounds of the ginger family such as zingiberene, gingerol, paradol, gingerdione, and shogaol not appearing at all?
- 8. The authors claim that FD-G has higher antioxidant activity (DPPH radical quenching activity and ABTS scavenging activity) compared to OD-G and RW-G, even though the DPPH values of the extracts are nearly identical, specifically: DPPH radical scavenging property of RW-G (53.12%), OD-G (56.65%), and FD-G (57.65%). Similar results are observed for ABTS scavenging activity of RW-G (42.99 mg.TE/g), OD-G (63.35 mg.TE/g), and FD-G (67.30 mg.TE/g). Could you please clarify this discrepancy?

Upon revision and supplementation by the authors, the manuscript will be accepted for publication.

