



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCS_38036
Title of the Manuscript:	Free Radical Scavenging Activity of Jatropha curcas Leaves, Phytochemical And Antibacterial Analysis of its Butanol Fraction
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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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 use of English should be standard. 2. In line 24-44: The author(s) did not mentioned the previous researchers have done on <i>J. curcas</i> leaves in introduction mean while a number of publications already release for reference. 3. In line 97-240: Most stated procedures did not referred to reference. 4. In line 174-184: The sentences display similarity to Kingsley and Marshal's paper (http://www.journalrepository.org/media/journals/AIR_31/2014/Jul/Kingsley2112014AIR9452_1.pdf). 5. In line 188-197: The sentences display similarity to Kingsley and Marshal's paper (http://www.journalrepository.org/media/journals/AIR_31/2014/Jul/Kingsley2112014AIR9452_1.pdf). 6. In line 249: What kind of the unit of scavenging activity? 7. In line 263: In Table 2, how does phlobatannins absented in qualitative has mass in quatitative? 8. In line 268-269: Two phytochemical compounds in Table 2 did not run phytochemical testing but they got + sign. How did the author(s) decide the sign? 9. In line 310-311: "the antimicrobial activities ...through different mechanisms." Could the author(s) explain the such different mechanisms? 10. In line 317: "... a high free radical scavenging activity." Based on what kind data the author(s) claimed the statement? <p>Plagiarism Issue: Yes, a number of procedures are not referenced. The author(s) seem unrespect to other researchers' work by not declaring a citation that should be referred. The manuscript has index similarity as much as 41% by Turnitin's plagiarism checker. I provide the prove in two-pdf sheet.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted 2. Line 41-44 has cleared this with references 6-9 3. Lines 109-110 has been referenced with Refc; 15&16; Line 125-128 refced with, 17 -20 and Line 237 -240 Refc. 16. All procedures have been referenced. 4. Unit of scavenging activity on Line 266 mg/kg is same as ppm. 5. Presence of phlobatanins as been corrected 6. Phlobatanins Corrected on line 280 7. The statement " ...through different mechanism" is credited to the works of Igbinosa <i>et al</i> 2009. 8. Query 10; is based on the emperical data this research as revealed. <p>Majority of the issues have been referenced.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		