

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	Research 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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The manuscript is important to the scientific community working on the traditional medicine plants.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No. The authors were suggested to include more literature review on the topic.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The manuscript is poorly written with major grammatically and spelling error. The authors were suggested to go for professional proofread before submission.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>(1) The authors were suggested to give more comprehensive introduction on the study crop. Meanwhile, the literature review on the medicinal properties study on the crop was missing and the authors should provide information about the background study of the medicinal value of the crop.</p> <p>(2) At the material and methods part. The authors were suggested to include how many replicate of the samples were included in the study.</p> <p>(3) For the discussion, the authors were suggested to include more convincing evidence from the previous study in compare to the current reported result.</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:	Khew Choy Yuen
Department, University & Country	Malaysia