

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFRN_154678
Title of the Manuscript:	PROXIMATE COMPOSITION, FUNCTIONAL PROPERTIES, AND MINERAL COMPOSITION OF WHOLE MEAL, DEFATTED, AND PROTEIN HYDROLYSATES FROM EDIBLE GRASSHOPPER
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript provides valuable insights into the nutritional, functional, and mineral properties of edible grasshopper protein products, including whole meal, defatted meal, and protein hydrolysates. By characterizing these properties, the study contributes to the growing body of research on alternative and sustainable protein sources, which are increasingly important for addressing global food security challenges. The findings highlight the potential of grasshoppers as a rich source of protein, essential minerals, and bioactive compounds, offering practical implications for human nutrition and the development of functional foods. Overall, this work advances scientific understanding of insect-based proteins and supports their consideration as a viable option for both health and environmental sustainability.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	YES	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	YES	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	YES	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	YES	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
--	--	--

Review Form 3

<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>ABSTRACT</p> <p>The abstract addresses a relevant topic regarding the nutritional and functional potential of grasshopper proteins as an alternative protein source. However, it requires improvements to enhance its clarity and scientific quality. The methodological section is too detailed for an abstract and should be more concise. In addition, some language and terminology errors need to be corrected (for example, degutted should be replaced with eviscerated, and in vitro should be properly written). The presentation of the results also lacks precision, particularly regarding the association of the reported values with the different samples studied, and the units used for the mineral composition appear inappropriate. Finally, the conclusion should focus more on the nutritional and functional significance of grasshopper proteins rather than on recommendations related to production. Therefore, a linguistic and structural revision of the abstract is recommended.</p> <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><input type="checkbox"/> The introduction provides a thorough overview of edible insects, particularly grasshoppers, as alternative protein sources with nutritional, functional, and environmental benefits.<input type="checkbox"/> Several points are repeated, especially regarding the nutritional and environmental advantages of insects, which could be consolidated.<input type="checkbox"/> Nutrient percentages and units should be consistent throughout the text.<input type="checkbox"/> The structure could be improved by clearly separating sections: global food security, nutritional value, bioactive compounds, and the specific focus on grasshoppers.<input type="checkbox"/> References and citations should follow a consistent format.<input type="checkbox"/> The final sentence introducing the study's aim is abrupt and could be revised to clearly state the research objective and its significance.<input type="checkbox"/> Overall, editing for conciseness, logical flow, and consistency would significantly strengthen the introduction. <p>METHODOLOGY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The methodology is generally well-described, providing details on sample collection, preparation (harvesting, evisceration, washing, drying, milling, defatting), and hydrolysis of grasshopper proteins.• Some procedural details are overly long for a manuscript and could be summarized or moved to supplementary materials to improve readability.• Language and terminology should be carefully checked; for example, "degutted" should be replaced by "eviscerated," and "invitro" should be "in vitro."• The description of analytical methods (proximate composition, functional properties, mineral analysis) lacks clarity regarding specific standards or protocols used; referencing official methods would strengthen reproducibility.• Units and ranges reported for nutritional and functional parameters should be consistent and clearly linked to the corresponding sample type (WGM, DGM, GHM).• Statistical analysis is mentioned in results but not clearly described in the methods; specifying tests, significance levels, and software used is recommended.. <p>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</p>	
---	--	--

Review Form 3

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The results are comprehensive, covering proximate composition, functional properties, mineral content, and bioactive compounds of the grasshopper samples (WGM, DGM, GHM). <input type="checkbox"/> The presentation of data is sometimes unclear; ranges are given without specifying which sample corresponds to each value, which can confuse readers. <input type="checkbox"/> Units for nutrients and minerals should be standardized and consistently reported throughout the section. <input type="checkbox"/> Some statements in the discussion repeat information already presented in the introduction or results; these could be consolidated to improve conciseness. <input type="checkbox"/> Statistical differences are mentioned ($p < 0.05$), but details about the tests used are lacking; this should be clearly described for reproducibility. <input type="checkbox"/> The discussion effectively links findings to previous studies but occasionally overgeneralizes or includes speculative claims without sufficient evidence. <input type="checkbox"/> Language and phrasing need improvement in some sentences to enhance clarity and scientific tone. <input type="checkbox"/> Overall, the section provides valuable data and interpretations but would benefit from clearer presentation, consistent units, concise writing, and careful linking of results to discussion points. 	
--	--	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in detail)</i>	

Reviewer details:

Akotegnon Rodrigue Azonwakin, Guinean Higher School of Tourism and Hospitality, Guinea