

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_89864
Title of the Manuscript:	PHYTOCHEMICAL SCREENING AND IN VITRO ANTIOXIDANT ACTIVITY OF THE AQUEOUS EXTRACT OF DETARIUM SENEGALENSIS ROOT BARK
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://journalajrb.com/index.php/AJRB/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>This investigation on DETARIUM SENEGALENSIS ROOT BARK is commendable as most studies often focus on the aerial parts with less attention on the roots of plants. However, even at very large concentrations, the activities investigated are insignificant. Total antioxidant capacity at 1000 microgram/ml is not comparable with ascorbic acid. Same with reduction power. %DPPH even at 10,000microgram/ml is very insignificant and incomparable to the standard. Then %nitric oxide scavenging activity has no dose-dependent activity, and based on the IC50 results presented, the potency of ascorbic acid is more than twice the activity of the plant.</p> <p>Furthermore, the total phenolic content of the plant was calculated as 72.52 microgram gallic acid equivalent/g of extract. There is no comparison with any literature-cited standard or a table of total phenolic contents to properly evaluate the significance of the phenolic content of the plant.</p> <p>The conclusion is that DETARIUM SENEGALENSIS ROOT BARK has insignificant antioxidant activities. I strongly recommend that the authors revise this manuscript in-line with the results presented. Additionally, it would help if a GCMS analysis of this root bark is carried out to detect the presence/absence of compounds that may possess antioxidant activities.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	The paper has several grammatical errors. Also, the authors reported that the roots were air-dried for two weeks and later oven-dried. The temperature at which the roots were oven-dried was not reported and again the rationale behind oven-drying after air-drying for two weeks was not explained.	
Optional/General comments	The author should report numerical values to 2 decimal places consistently; not variable decimal places.	

Review Form 1.6

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:	Johnson-Ajinwo, Okiemute Rosa
Department, University & Country	University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria