

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"

Emad A.S. Al-Dujaili¹

¹ University of Edinburgh

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I have now reviewed the manuscript entitled: 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.

I have found the article to be very important for research and industry and has been done in a scientific manner. I have the following concerns:

1. I do not encourage the use of organic solvents for the extraction of natural products. I prefer the hydro-extraction methods to avoid toxic substances being extracted and the harmful effects of organic solvents.
2. Have the authors tried, for comparison, the extraction with pure water, and what are the results?
3. How do the authors explain the huge differences in the GC/MS outcomes, total phenolics, total flavonoids, and anti-inflammatory values? It seems to me that the extracts contain very high flavonoid contents—why?
4. Figure 3's legend is not clear and needs further explanation for the reader without going to the text.
5. I have not seen the differences between all these preparations and what they are. How are they prepared?
6. Table 3: The 2D interaction of protein – ligand interaction. I am lost in this table. The reader needs some explanation as to what all these interactions mean. Is it necessary to put all on one table? The authors have to explain what is going on, and not only provide a copy from the instrument.
7. Again, for all tests that have been done, there has to be some explanation as to why they are done? What is the importance of the data to our product? ...etc for all figures 4 to 8.
8. Some English typo errors are present throughout the manuscript that require corrections.
9. The authors cannot jump quickly to such a conclusion: "This study opens the door for the prospective development of effective anti-inflammatory and antioxidant medications." There is no evidence for that yet.
10. The discussion is weak, and I regard it as comments on the results. A critical discussion is required in relation to the literature and other studies.

