

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCS_101976
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative study of the effect of two extraction solvents on polyphenols content and antioxidant activity of <i>Alstonia boonei</i> bark
Type of the 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)
<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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>In part. The manuscript presented a simple comparative study of two kinds of extracts (aqueous and hydroethanol) of <i>Alstonia boonei</i> bark in relation to polyphenol content and antioxidant activity. Other kinds of extracts could be obtained and explored. And also other part of the plant could be explored.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>In part. "Materials and method" section should be more organized in relation of assay of plant contents.</p> <p>In part because it is not clear how the plant content was calculated. Consider adding the equations.</p> <p>In part. Some references cited on the manuscript were not present in "References" section (e.g. Fonkoua et al., 2021; Green et al., 1982 and others). And there are no citation of the references showing extract preparations of <i>Alstonia boonei</i>. Please revise carefully.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Statistical analyses of the results presented have not been carried out appropriately and have not been explained. Add "Statistical analyses" subitem in the "Material and methods" and presents the mean value followed by the standard deviation. - Some parts of the manuscript are not in English and font size is reduced suddenly along the manuscript. Please revise carefully. - Fig. 1c: the difference found for 2 extracts is statistically significant? - Table 3 and 4: changing the presentation of the correlations to graphs would be more interesting. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>In part. It is recommended to improve English quality.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lilian Rumi Tsuruta
Department, University & Country	Butantan Institute, Brazil