

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_107500
Title of the Manuscript:	Phytochemical screening, evaluation and comparative study of the antioxidant activities of leaves and stem bark extracts from Anogeissus leiocarpus: a plant used in traditional medicine in northern ivory coast
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>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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1) The manuscript "Phytochemical screening, evaluation and comparative study of the antioxidant activities of leaves and stem bark extracts from Anogeissus leiocarpus: a plant used in traditional medicine in northern ivory coast" could be important for scientific community, especially for those working on pharmacognosy and botanicals fields. Traditional medicine is an important source of compounds that could potentially become drugs themselves (how happened to some botanicals such as St John's wort (SJW) extracts, prepared from the aerial parts of Hypericum perforatum) or that could be used as scaffold for advance pharmaceutical chemistry. The analysis of general biological activity (such as antioxidant activity) of plant extracts, that have been traditionally used for ages, represent the essential starting point.</p> <p>2) Yes, it is.</p> <p>3) Yes, it is comprehensive, anyway English quality should be improved.</p> <p>4) Yes, they are.</p> <p>5) Yes, it is, anyway more updated analytical methods would have been more appropriated. TLC is a very old method and HPLC coupled with other detectors would have been ideal for unveiling all the molecules included in the extracts. Line 61: Extraction methods: references should be added. Did the author develop the methods? Were the methods already known in literature or pharmacopoeia?</p> <p>6) More recent works should be added: <i>"In vitro</i> evaluation of the antioxidant potential, phenolic and flavonoid contents of the stem bark ethanol extract of <i>Anogeissus leiocarpus</i>" (JO Olugbami, MA Gbadegesin, and OA Odunola)-2014 "Antidiabetic and antioxidant potential of total extract and supernatant fraction of the roots of <i>Anogeissus leiocarpus</i> in HFD-fed and Streptozocin -induced diabetic rats" Aku Enam Motto, Povi Lawson-Evi, Kwashie Eklu-Gadegbeku - 2022 "Antioxidant, organ protective and ameliorative properties of methanol extract of <i>Anogeissus leiocarpus</i> stem bark against carbon tetrachloride-induced liver injury" S.E. Atawodi, O.O. Adekunle, Indhirajith Balasubramanian -2011</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>English quality should be improved. Typos can be found in the manuscript (e.g. line 29 For instance instead of for instance; line 37 antioydant). In addition, choice of words should be improved (line 38, sentence; specifically, it will be to carry out phytochemical screening and evaluate the antioxidant activity of the two plant materials of <i>A. leiocarpus</i>).</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:	Elena Dalle Vedove
Department, University & Country	Italy