

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology  |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_JABB_109023  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Evaluation of Antisickling Activity and Antibacterial Potential of Methanolic Root Extract of Ximenia americana Linn. (Olacaceae) |
| Type of the Article      |   |

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b><br/>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br/>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The manuscript certainly reports on a topic of interest to the scientific community and proposes the use of a native plant for sickle cell disease in folk medicine. This is the basis of a more than preliminary study, as the cytotoxicity data of the extract, or the qualitative-quantitative profile of the components, should be provided.</li> <li>The title of the article is suitable.</li> <li>The abstract of the article is comprehensive.</li> <li>It is my opinion that the subsections and structure of the manuscript are not entirely adequate. I gave directions to the authors directly on the manuscript in revision mode.</li> <li>I consider the manuscript to be scientifically correct, although some parts should be further elaborated.</li> <li>The references are not recent: very few refer to work published after 2020, most are from the early 2000s. I suggest the authors try to 'freshen up' the bibliography a bit.</li> </ol> <p><b>I have indicated other suggestions and/or questions for authors directly in the text.</b></p> |   |
| <p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>  | YES   |   |
| <p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p> | <p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> |   |

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |                                     |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Name:                            | <b>Anna Baldisserotto</b>           |
| Department, University & Country | <b>University of Ferrara, Italy</b> |