



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_37629
Title of the Manuscript:	ANTIOXIDANT ACTIVITY OF MORCHELLA CONICA COLLECTED FROM SWAT VALLEY
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	- You can only represent a result or data in a table or bar chart format but not both. Because table 1 and figure1 seems the same. - How was <i>Morchella conica</i> identified? Because it is supposed to be identified before use. - Line 160-161: please rephrase to " it can be concluded from the study that water extraction of <i>Morchella conica</i> possess high antioxidant activity with increase in extracts concentration.	According to your suggestion I have only left the table. <i>Morchella conica</i> was pre-identified and collected from swat mentioned in paper. Rephrased to "Screening of different methanolic concentrations of water extract of M. conica showed increase in antioxidant activity with increase in concentration. It is therefore concluded that water extract of Morchella possesses a strong antioxidant activity with highest potential in 3000 ppm water extract."
Minor REVISION comments	- Line 8: conducted at University... - Line 9: in - Line 47: belonging..... - Line 107: have - Line 133: high	Revised and corrected
Optional/General comments		