

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_96191
Title of the Manuscript:	Antioxidant Activity-Guided Isolation of Phenolic Compounds from <i>Vitex pubescens</i> Vahl Leaves
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.journalcsij.com/index.php/CSIJ/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	There are some suggestions to add in the manuscript, try to see in the manuscript. thank you <b>1. The topics discussed are very interesting to me, so I'm happy to correct them. But, seems to have a lot of research topics related to it. Therefore, there should be quite a lot of improvisation to make the topic more interesting.</b> <b>2. I think the Title is suitable</b> <b>3. Yes, it is. That makes the article is too general</b> <b>4. No, they are not. That makes the article is too general</b> <b>5. Yes, I do. I think the manuscript scientifically correct enough</b> <b>6. No, They are not. Please takes the references recent</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	I think the language/English quality easy to understand	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rezza Ruzuqi
Department, University & Country	Marine and Fisheries Polytechnic of Sorong, Indonesia