

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_77824
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Antioxidant and Phytochemical Assessment of Trichilia Monadelpha (Thonn.) J.J. de Wilde (Meliaceae) Plant Extracts
Type of the 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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The title need to be edited eg "Comparative Assessment of Phytochemical Contents and Antioxidant Activities Of Different Leaf Extracts of Trichilia Monadelpha" 2. Keywords should be related to the title/result, not methodology 3. The author needs English editing to present this work properly. Most long sentences end up confusing the reader. 4. Tables and equations should be clearly presented 5. The references were not serially quoted in the text. The author needs to be acquainted with referencing styles. Authors' guidelines for this journal should be consulted. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The result section should be separated from the discussion section to allow good discussion of the results. 2. The whole text, especially result/discussion, should be properly arranged. 3. Tables should be more organized 4. The percentage yields given in abstract are different from those given in result section – harmonize them 	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All words, phrases and sentences in red should be expunged 2. All words, phrases and sentences in green should be added 3. All words, phrases and sentences in yellow should be rephrased for better understanding <p>Generally, the work is fairly good but the presentation is poor. It needs serious overhaul.</p>	

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:	Ogbodo Sylvester O
Department, University & Country	Enugu State University of Science & Technology, Nigeria