

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

Bruno Edson-Chaves<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universidade Estadual do Ceará

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Illustrations are essential for getting to know the species better. However, the illustrations presented show little about the species. I suggest putting an image of the tree as a whole, followed by the flowers, leaves, and bark (with the resin). Then the isolated resins and the image highlighted in D (which would clearly change the letter). It's also worth mentioning them in the text.

Do not abbreviate the scientific name in the way that has been done. *Acacia pycnantha* should be abbreviated as *A. pycnantha*. The way it has been laid out violates the International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants.

What does the literature say about why some trees naturally produce gum and others don't? From an anatomical point of view, it doesn't make sense, given that the same species shares common anatomical characteristics, and secretory cells are a characteristic of the species. Could it be that it's not the stage of life of the plant that interferes with gum production?

In one passage you quote: "The chemical composition of AP and GA." If AP is *Acacia pycnantha* (wrongly named), how can you say the chemical composition of the species? The chemical composition of exudates varies according to the time of day, organ, time of year, and a multitude of factors. What did you really mean by this sentence?

The end of the introduction does not present the justification and objectives of the research. After all, what question do you want to answer with this work?

The methodology is confusing. How many trees were used to extract the exudate, and at what time of day? Information at the end of the first paragraph and the 2nd and 3rd paragraphs doesn't provide any information relevant to the methodology.

Given the lack of objectives and a consistent methodology, the results and conclusions are also confusing. After all, the

aim of the paper is to compare the yield of gum extracted from plants in Africa and Australia?