

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_118940
Title of the Manuscript:	GC-MS Analysis, Quantitative Phytochemical Profile and in vitro antioxidant studies of the stem bark of <i>Dennetia tripetala</i> BAK. F. (Annonaceae).
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> <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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The well-written and structured manuscript facilitates readers' comprehension of the objectives, irrespective of the study's methods, findings, and conclusions.</p> <p>Though I think the research presented in the article is commendable, there are a few areas, particularly with the results section where I think some adjustments could improve the article's clarity and impact. There are however some contradictions regarding the results of total phenolic content and the IC 50 values.</p> <p>The percentage inhibitions mentioned in the results are much higher than 50% it is advisable to use lower concentrations of extracts.</p> <p>The other necessary modifications are noted in the manuscript as comments.</p> <p>Overall, with a few small adjustments and improvements the manuscript is good to go for publication.</p> <p>I'm interested to see how the writers develop their work and respond to these suggestions</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 		
<p>Optional/General 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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Felicity Pinipay
Department, University & Country	Andhra University, India