

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_109449
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF THE ANTIOXIDANT ACTIVITY OF AQUEOUS AND HYDRO-ETHANOLIC EXTRACTS OF FICUS CAPENSIS, NEWBOULDIA LAEVIS AND CARPOLOBIA LUTEA.
Type of the Article	research article

### 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript is of scientific interest. It highlights the natural antioxidants in certain plants that can be used to combat the free radicals responsible for certain diseases, using two extraction methods.</p> <p>2. The title needs to be revised, because antioxidant activity was not assessed in the manuscript but earlier quantitative determination of antioxidant activity based on the flavonoid content of the base plant product. or talk about extracting antioxidants</p> <p>3. Yes, but the work does not specify why the choice of the species Ficus capensis, Newbouldia laevis and Carpolobia lutea</p> <p>4. Yes, but the conclusion of the abstract should state that the work has been done for what purpose. The general objective of the work is not specified in the introduction.</p> <p>5. I find the manuscript scientifically correct, acceptable and suitable for publication</p> <p>6. the bibliographical references need to be revised slightly. the journals are not in italics.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. The quality of the language used is better. understanding is easier</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>the manuscript as a whole can be published in its original form whether the author can take account of minor observations</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><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Logbo Jhonn</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>National University of Agriculture, Benin</b>