

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_100009
Title of the Manuscript:	ISOLATION, CHARACTERIZATION AND EVALUATION OF THE ANTIOXIDANT POTENTIAL OF DIFFERENT EXTRACTS AND BIOMOLECULES OF THE ROOTS OF PAULLINIA PINNATA (Sapindaceae)
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes Yes Yes Suggested to incorporate certain concepts Yes Meets the purpose	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Good	
Optional/General comments	Research article has been written in a systematic manner. There are certain parts have to be described in methodology, regarding identification of plant, authentication of plant, processing of root, extraction methods etc. The details regarding number of times experiment repeated for getting the reliable consistency value for antioxidant study should be mentioned. Statistical data also to be presented. All the above points have been marked in the concerned page of the article with my comment and suggestion.	

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:	Thamizh Selvam. N
Department, University & Country	India