

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCS_98940
Title of the Manuscript:	Total Polyphenols, Total Flavonoids, Condensed Tannins, and Antioxidant Activity of Borassus aethiopum (Arecaceae) mature fruits' Peels, and combined Peel-Pulps, dried at different temperatures.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajocs.com/index.php/AJOCS/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1= Yes, it is important for scientific community for at least it tells about how to dry the fruit part to get high phytochemical and high antioxidant activity. 2= The title of the article is suitable. 3= The abstract is comprehensive, but some words are needed to be edited such as ECat/g (in other parts, it is written as CatE/g) 4= "Antioxidant activity of the extracts" should be placed after "Condensed tannin evaluation" 5= Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct. 6= Too many versions for reference style, so the authors must check and edit the reference. 7= Symbol about ABTS radical cation is needed to be edited. 8= All figures (1, 2, 3, and 4) must be newly designed for easier understanding. 9= The authors use many words for gallic acid equivalent (GEA, AGE, GAE), so they must select only one and use it in entire manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1= the English language is needed to be checked by an expert.	
Optional/General comments	For each table, there is confusion about which extraction (maceration, decoction, or ??) was performed before phytochemical and antioxidant determination.	

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Patthraporn Siripipathana
Department, University & Country	Maharakham University, Thailand