

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	Contemporary Research and Perspectives in Biological Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2641
Title of the Manuscript:	A Critical Review of the Cardio-Protective Potential of Diets and Foods Rich in Soluble Fibre
Type of the Article	Book Chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is important for the scientific community because it highlights the cardio-protective potential of soluble fibers, an area of growing interest in both nutrition science and public health. The detailed exploration of different fiber types and their mechanisms in reducing cardiovascular risks provides valuable insights that can contribute to dietary guidelines and preventive healthcare strategies. I appreciate the manuscript's comprehensive literature review, but it could benefit from a stronger emphasis on clinical data and specific intervention outcomes to enhance its applicability.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the article is suitable as it accurately reflects the content of the manuscript, specifically its focus on the cardio-protective potential of diets and foods rich in soluble fiber. It is clear and concise, making it easy for readers to understand the primary focus of the review. No alternative title is necessary.	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive and provides a good overview of the manuscript's content, summarizing the key topics like soluble fiber, cardiovascular diseases, and dietary interventions. However, it could be improved by specifying the distinct types of soluble fibers discussed and their unique benefits. Additionally, the abstract should highlight more specific findings or conclusions drawn from the review, such as key recommendations or practical applications. Suggestions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Include brief mentions of specific soluble fibers (e.g., pectin, β-glucan) and their respective health impacts. 2. Highlight one or two key takeaways or recommendations from the review for more practical relevance. 3. Consider shortening the explanation of dietary intervention and focusing more on the study's critical findings. 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate. Suggestions for Improvement: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Some subsections, particularly those on fatty acids and functional foods, could be more concise to improve readability. 2. Consider adding a dedicated conclusion section that summarizes the main findings and provides practical recommendations for future research or dietary guidelines. 3. The manuscript could benefit from a clearer distinction between different types of fibers and their specific impacts to avoid redundancy and enhance clarity. 	

[Review Form2](#)

<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript demonstrates strong scientific rigor by thoroughly reviewing a wide range of studies on the cardio-protective effects of soluble fibers. It effectively synthesizes current knowledge, discussing the biochemical mechanisms through which soluble fiber contributes to cardiovascular health, particularly in reducing cholesterol levels. The manuscript is well-supported by relevant literature, though incorporating more recent clinical trials would further enhance its technical soundness. The manuscript provides a comprehensive and scientifically valid examination of this important topic.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =</p>	<p>The references provided are sufficient in number and cover a broad range of relevant studies on soluble fibers and cardiovascular health. However, some of the references are slightly outdated, with a noticeable gap in more recent studies from 2021 onwards. Incorporating more up-to-date research would strengthen the manuscript's relevance and scientific foundation, especially given the advancements in dietary interventions and cardiovascular disease prevention in recent years.</p> <p>Suggestions: Consider adding more recent references (2021-2024), especially studies that focus on clinical trials or meta-analyses related to soluble fibers and their cardiovascular benefits. This will ensure that the manuscript reflects the latest scientific findings.</p>	
<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The manuscript contains some grammatical errors, awkward phrasing, and overly complex sentence structures, which can hinder readability. Simplifying certain sentences and correcting minor grammatical mistakes would improve clarity and make the manuscript more accessible to readers.</p> <p>Suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Revise long and complex sentences to improve readability. 2. Address minor grammatical errors, particularly with punctuation and word choice. 3. Ensure consistency in terminology, especially when discussing different types of fibers and cardiovascular outcomes. 	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Yashwant Kumar Patel</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Atal Bihari Vajpayee Vishwavidyalaya, India</p>