

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ AFSJ_122789
Title of the Manuscript:	SPATIAL SPECIFICITY OF ANTIOXIDANT CAPACITY ASSAY IN FIVE VARIETIES OF (<i>Moringa oleifera</i>) LEAVES EXTRACTS
Type of the Article	

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)
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.	The manuscript is relevant for the scientific community as it tries to provide scientific evidence for antioxidant capacity of <i>M. oleifera</i> in selected countries.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title fits the manuscript	
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.	Yes, the abstract is comprehensive enough.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the subsection of the manuscripts is appropriate and fit the context of the manuscript	
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.	The study aims to fill a gap in literature regarding the antioxidant activity of <i>M. oleifera</i> in selected countries. The study employed the appropriate scientific method, making the manuscript scientifically stout.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, enough references have been provided in the manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the English language used in the manuscripts is good for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Font size inconsistency: some of the text appears in font size 12 while others appear in font size 11. check and format it according to the journal's requirement. 2. Be consistent with how you write et al., Some appear in italics and other are not. Be consistent with one. 3. A few misspellings of scientific names were seen in the manuscript 4. Other comments have been indicated in the manuscript for the author's consideration. 	

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Joshua Dwomoh
Department, University & Country	Akenten Appiah -Menka University of Skills Training and Entrepreneurial Development, Ghana