

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIMPS_106716
Title of the Manuscript:	Bioactive compounds and antioxidant potential of aqueous and hydroethanolic extracts of Cola lateritia fruit parts
Type of the Article	Research Article

Review Form 1.7

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, the choice of the topic is satisfactory</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>1. Check the abbreviations throughout the manuscript and introduce the abbreviation when the full word appears the first time in the abstract and the remaining for the text and then use only the abbreviation (For example, DPPH, TPC, PCA, etc.). Make a word abbreviated in the article that is repeated at least three times in the text, not all words to be abbreviated.</p> <p>2. The full form of the species should be given when the first time appears in both the abstract and in the remaining part of the manuscript and it should be followed by only the first letter of the genus (For example, <i>Cola lateritia</i> when the first time appear and followed by <i>C. lateritia</i>). The genus name should be starts with capital letter.</p> <p>3. The time of collection of this species should be added. As it is well-known that one of the factors affecting the constituents is the time of collection, so please give top priority to this issue.</p> <p>4. The authors may include the details of the quantity of fresh sample used and the quantity of the powder obtained (the ratio between fresh plant and powder) under the heading materials and methods.</p> <p>5. The limitation of the present study may be given along with conclusion or under separate heading for understanding the concepts clearly.</p> <p>6. The references are not arranged properly in a uniform format and it should be carefully checked and corrected as per the journal instructions. For example, the authors have given the initials of the authors cited after the name, but not for few references "C. P. Parente et al., 2013"; "M-A. Angie Mbong et al., 2020".</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>1. The English need improvement since there are some grammatical and syntax errors in the manuscript. For example, the words "Lowest" may be as "The lowest"; "in AE" as "in the AE"; "the evidence" as "evidence"; "During the recent" as "In the recent"; "laid on" as "paid to"; "daily" as "a daily"; "sufficient" as "a sufficient"; "knowledge has" as "knowledge have"; "the food with biological" as "food with biologically"; "arrival to" as "arrival at"; "during a week" as "for a week"; "wavelength" as "a wavelength"; "lowest" as "the lowest"; "saponins was" as "saponins were"; "of extracts" as "of the extracts"; "were observed" as "was observed"; "a Pearson" as "Pearson"; "was aimed" as "aimed"; "of bioactive" as "of the bioactive"; "correlation on" as "correlation between"; "vary among"</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>as “vary from”; “well the” as “well as the”; “potential have” as “potential has”; “and structure” as “and its structure”; “extracts is” as “extracts are”. The grammar mistakes which are not mentioned here are also to be checked and corrected properly.</p> <p>2. There are some typing mistakes as well, and authors are advised to carefully proof-read the text. For example, the words “under valorized” may be as “under-valorized”; “different extract” as “different extracts”; “which exhibited” as “which exhibit”; “to human” as “to humans”; “or diseases” as “or disease”; “contributes” as “contribute”; “however” as “however,”; “that, underutilized” as “that underutilized”; “rising” as “raising”; “South-East” as “southeast”; “south-west” as “southwest”; “to generate” as “to generating”; “different analysis” as “different analyses”; “Folin-ciocalteu” as “Folin-Ciocalteu”; “microgram of” as “micrograms of”; “Subsequently” as “Subsequently,”; “as statistical” as “as statistically”; “alkaloid and” as “alkaloids and”; “tannins content” as “tannin content”; “concentration dependent” as “concentration-dependent”; “activity dependent” as “activity-dependent”; “Table 2: correlation” as “Table 2: Correlation”; “strogly” as “strongly”; “tannins where” as “tannins were”; “results suggests” as “results suggest”; “well accepted” as “well-accepted”; “consume by” as “consumed by”; “alkaloids content” as “alkaloid content”; “fig” as “Fig”; “each fruits” as “each fruit”; “various kind” as “various kinds”; “that, the” as “that the”; “leaded” as “led”. The typos not mentioned here are also to be checked and corrected properly.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The authors have put effort to evaluate the “Bioactive compounds and antioxidant potential of aqueous and hydroethanolic extracts of Cola lateritia fruit parts”. The authors describe the results undertaken with this in an organized manner, emphasizing the results obtained by them. The article needs modification for better cohesion of information to achieve the goal and the shortcomings which need to be considered. Plagiarism need to be checked since I don’t have any commercial software for checking it. Hence, the paper can be accepted after MAJOR REVISIONS are carried out.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>A. Vijaya Anand</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Bharathiar University, India</p>

Review Form 1.7