



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	<p>Dear Colleague,</p> <p>Kindly check the following comments that may help:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The abstract part is too long and not to the point. Try to shorten it and focus on results. 2. Why you focus on butanol fraction although you did also ethanol extract? 3. Is it butanol fraction or extract as both were written? 4. Please add values and results in numbers in abstract part. 5. The conclusion of abstract part should be for the present work not for future recommendations. 6. The introduction part is lacking information about the plant and its reported active constituents, folk uses and biological activities, also no reference for uses in lines 39 and 40. 7. In line 50, what is meant by rheumatoid ulcerative colitis? 8. Parts 1.1 and 1.2 belongs to which part of manuscript? I think you'd better omit them. 9. Beakers, test tubes etc. are not usually written. 10. The chemicals used, plant and apparatus should be with full details about the grade of chemical and its manufacturer, the plant part used, fresh or dried, exact weight and who identified it, the apparatus specifications. All are missing. 11. Decantation is not the proper way in extract preparation. It should have been filtered through cotton or muslin. 12. Add mls of butanol used in butanol extract preparation. 13. Lines 104-108 are unclear. 14. The equations provided are added as caption not written. Write them instead please. 15. For the qualitative and quantitative assays, you may add reference for each test instead of writing full details of simple experiments just to fill spaces unnecessarily. 16. For alkaloid determination, Kjeldahl's method is not specific as the amount of proteins and any other nitrogenous material will be miscalculated as well. 17. The two equations in line 158 and 159 are the same. Why rewritten? 18. In line 225 and 226, "into two different" what? The sentence is incomplete. 19. Please specify the microorganisms used in the study. 20. In table 2, how can you tell which type of tannin present, also for phenol? 21. In conclusion part, you missed writing about antibacterial activity. 22. According to author guidelines, kindly abbreviate all journal names in references part. <p>Thank You and Good Luck</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Results added 2. Worked on Butanol extract 3. All butanol extract in the document has been changed to butanol crude extract. 4. Values added 5. Conclusion shortened 6. Information inserted lines 39 -44 with references 7. Changed to its shortened form rheumatism, Line 55 8. Introduction part 9. Noted and deleted 10. Identification and amount of plant sample used corrected Lines 92-99; Chemical grades and manufacturer included Lines 82-86. Instruments and their models Line 88-89. 11. Was actually filtered after decantation – corrected Line 104. 12. Butanol was added in excess until the leaves were totally immersed. 13. Procedure for the DPPH analysis. 14. Don't understand this comment (what equation, on which line?) 15. References inserted Line 125-129. Chief editor should determine if all the procedures should be removed. 16. Don't agree 17. One of the equations has been deleted. 18. Corrected on Line 239. 19. Specified Line 237 – 240 20. It was only their presence and amount that was checked for not the type. 21. Included Line: 334-335 22. Journal names abbreviated in the reference part.
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Typing error in line 204, reportedly instead of repeatedly. 2. <i>In vitro</i> should be <i>italic</i>. Lines 335 and 340. 	Corrections 1 and 2 effected
Optional/General comments		