

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Plant Research Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_APRJ_124548
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Analysis of the Phytochemicals and in vitro Antioxidant Prowess of Methanolic Extracts of Fadogia cienkowskii Leaves</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

## Review Form 3

### PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it provides valuable insights into the phytochemical composition and antioxidant potential of <i>Fadogia cienkowskii</i>, a plant widely used in traditional medicine. The study contributes to the growing body of research on natural antioxidants, offering potential applications in developing safe, plant-based therapeutic agents for conditions involving oxidative stress, such as malaria. I appreciate the manuscript's clear methodology and quantitative approach, which adds robustness to the findings. However, I would have liked to see more exploration into the pharmacological applications of the active compounds beyond antioxidant activity. Further investigation into their specific biological effects would enrich the study.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The current title, "Analysis of the Phytochemicals and in vitro Antioxidant Prowess of Methanolic Extracts of <i>Fadogia cienkowskii</i> Leaves", is informative but could be made more concise and focused. While it captures the essence of the study, the term "prowess" feels less scientific, and "in vitro" might be better emphasized earlier.</p> <p><b>Suggested Alternative Titles:</b></p> <p>"Phytochemical Profiling and In Vitro Antioxidant Activity of Methanolic Extracts from <i>Fadogia cienkowskii</i> Leaves"</p> <p>"In Vitro Antioxidant Potency and Phytochemical Composition of <i>Fadogia cienkowskii</i> Leaf Methanolic Extracts"</p> <p>"Phytochemical Composition and Antioxidant Activity of <i>Fadogia cienkowskii</i> Leaves: An In Vitro Study"</p> <p>These alternatives are more straightforward and highlight both key aspects of the study: phytochemical profiling and antioxidant analysis.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract is comprehensive, providing a clear summary of the research objectives, methodology, key results, and implications. However, there are areas where it could be improved for clarity, balance, and focus. Here are my suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The abstract includes redundant statements about the phenolic content (mentioned twice), which can be condensed.</li> <li>• It would be helpful to specify whether both qualitative and quantitative analyses were done for all phytochemicals, or just certain ones (like phenolics and flavonoids).</li> <li>• The specific antioxidant assays (DPPH, superoxide anion inhibition, and nitric oxide scavenging) are well described, but it would be helpful to clarify if these were the only methods used to evaluate antioxidant activity.</li> <li>• Comparisons to standards like ascorbic acid, quercetin, and <math>\alpha</math>-tocopherol should be mentioned earlier to highlight the relative efficacy of the extract.</li> <li>• The sentence mentioning the overall phenol content can be removed or combined with earlier statements about phenolic content to avoid repetition.</li> <li>• The abstract touches on the plant's antimalarial potential, but this is not thoroughly explored. While the connection to antioxidant activity is made, a brief mention of why antioxidants are linked to antimalarial effects would strengthen the abstract's conclusion.</li> <li>• A stronger statement about the potential future applications of the findings (beyond just "more investigation is required") could be included.</li> </ul>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	

### Review Form 3

<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound for several reasons. First, it employs well-established, standard procedures for both qualitative and quantitative phytochemical analyses, ensuring the reliability of the data. The antioxidant assays (DPPH, superoxide anion, and nitric oxide scavenging) are widely accepted and offer clear, reproducible methods for assessing free radical scavenging activities. Furthermore, the comparison of the extract's performance against known standards such as ascorbic acid, quercetin, and <math>\alpha</math>-tocopherol strengthens the validity of the results. The clear dose-response relationship observed in antioxidant activities also reinforces the scientific correctness of the study.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Yes; no possible suggestions!</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>While the manuscript is generally suitable for scholarly communication, refining the language for clarity, conciseness, and grammatical accuracy would significantly enhance its quality. A thorough proofreading by a colleague or a language expert could further improve the manuscript's readability and professionalism.</p> <p>Some sentences are long and complex, which can obscure the main points. Breaking them into shorter, clearer sentences would enhance readability. For example, the sentence starting with "Numerous processes, including hydrogen donation..." could be simplified for clarity.</p> <p>There are a few grammatical issues and punctuation errors, such as missing commas and inconsistent spacing (e.g., "3.646 <math>\pm</math> 0.45<math>\mu</math>g" should have a space before the unit).</p> <p>There are instances of repetition (e.g., mentioning the phenolic content multiple times), which could be streamlined to make the discussion more concise.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript presents valuable research with significant potential implications for the field of natural products and medicinal chemistry. By addressing the identified areas for improvement, the authors can enhance the clarity and impact of their findings, making the manuscript more suitable for publication in a scholarly journal.</p>	

### PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<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>Rajesh Rokkam</p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p>Andhra University, India</p>