

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

Lars Schmidt¹

¹ Copenhagen University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

It is really not clear what this research is all about, and part of the text is non-understandable. Several statements are misplaced in the AMRaD format. The writing should have a serious brush-up, and there should be a clear objective at the end of the introduction. Under materials and methods, I miss a clear description of what was done and why. The M&M are mixed up. For example: 'Seasonal conditions, rainfall, and location are likely to influence gum production.' First, it is not a method. Second, it was not investigated but is a kind of speculation belonging to the discussion (if anywhere). 2) Approximately 500 g of gum was collected per hour. This is a result (not a method), but I see nowhere a description of the time measurement of collection. 3) 20/50 trees, I presume, means 20 out of 50 trees (or what?). 4) 'The collected gum could be stored without refrigeration' - that could be a result (and not in the method section), but I do not see any method behind it. New information comes up that collection was attempted about 200 years ago (1936) - that would logically belong to the introduction and could have been used as a justification of the research. I recommend the author to make a major revision of the paper.