

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Research in Botany |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJRIB_110666 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | The comparison of antioxidative and cytotoxic activities of fresh and dried Piper Betle L. leave extracts on MCF-7, HELA and SK-LU-1 |
| Type of the Article | Data 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>Compulsory 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. Yes. This manuscript is important for the scientific community because it discusses research on antioxidative and cytotoxic activities of herbal medicine. considering that cancer is one of the highest causes of death in the world</p> <p>2. Yes. The title of the article suitable. The title in this manuscript is appropriate and describes the novelty, objectives, and content of the research.</p> <p>3. Yes. The article abstract is comprehensive. The abstract describes the background, objectives, methods, research results and conclusions.</p> <p>4. Yes. subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5. Yes. The manuscript is discussed by comparing previous research so that the scientific truth of the manuscript can be obtained.</p> <p>6. Yes. the references are sufficient and recent.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>1. Yes</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>Overall, it is good. However, some things need to be improved in the manuscript writing.</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> | |

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | Nur Cholis Endriyatno |
| Department, University & Country | Universitas Pekalongan, Indonesia |