

# 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"

Eman Ragab<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> National Research Center, Egypt

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

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

Dear authors,

The article presents interesting work for research and industry, and I have several recommendations to enhance the quality of the paper:

1. The title is too long, so consider shortening it to make it more concise and impactful. Also, the authors should choose between *Zingiber officinale Roscoe* and Ginger and use only one. This will prevent readers who are not in the field from confusing what plant was studied.
2. The scientific name of the plant studied should be written in italic format, *Zingiber officinale Roscoe*.
3. The authors should carefully check the article for grammatical errors and correct them as needed.
4. Apply all words, technical terms, and various units throughout this article in the same manner; for example, bioactive ability or bioactivities and bioactive or bio-active, minutes or mins, antioxidant or anti-oxidant.

Abstract:

-Please clarify the abstract to include more specific details about the study objectives, methods, key findings, and implications.

-There is no need to write numbers both in words and in parentheses. (In line 1 of the abstract)

- It would not be right to say "risk free" about any active ingredients, anti-inflammatory and antioxidant drugs. It could be declared as low risk, barely. (In line 3 of the abstract)

Methodology

- Numbers in chemical compounds should be written as subscripted, for example,  $\text{Na}_2\text{CO}_3$  and  $\text{NaNO}_2$ .
- Double-check the units and measurements used in the methodology, ensuring they are consistent and correctly stated. For example, volumes are consistently expressed in millilitres (mL) or microliters ( $\mu\text{L}$ ).
- ABTS radical scavenging capacity and nitric oxide scavenging activity analyses must be added to the methods section, although the study's results are provided. It is essential to verify whether the researchers have adequately explained the methodology.
- Explain which tools are used to predict toxicity in compounds, kindly mentioned in MS.
- On page 6, line 12, there is [35] as a reference; kindly mention it in the Reference section.

## Results

- $\text{IC}_{50}$  has to be determined for DPPH radical scavenging activity for a better comparison.
- Clarify the statistical analysis to evaluate the data definitively.

## Discussion

The discussion is weak, and I regard it as comments on the results. A critical discussion is required to compare the results against other similar studies.

## Reference

Update your references within the last 5 years.

Add all references in their main sectors

Yours sincerely,

Eman Ragab Zaki (Ph.D)

Molecular Biology Department,

Biotechnology Research Institute

National Research Center,