

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_102169
Title of the Manuscript:	Bioactive compounds and Antioxidant capacity from different fruit extracts of Aonla (<i>Emblica officinalis</i> Gaertn.)
Type of the Article	Short 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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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>1. Yes, it is. This work presents useful information for a future herbal preparation but the analytical methods used in this study are not accurate enough for reliable data.</p> <p>2. Yes, it is.</p> <p>3. No, it should be rewritten. Introduction or Background is too long and unnecessary for the abstract. The names of study compounds should be listed specifically in the material and methods and result parts of the abstract.</p> <p>4. Yes, it is.</p> <p>5. Not really. Why the ratio of 4:3:3 of Ethanol: Ethyl Acetate: Water was chosen is also not mentioned or cited. Furthermore, the results did not show statistical values; were the certain compound from these extracts significantly different?</p> <p>6. Most are quite old as the methods used for analyses.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	It is Okay.	
Optional/General 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Veeravan Lekskulchai
Department, University & Country	Srinakharinwirot University, Thailand