



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_31563
Title of the Manuscript:	Phytochemical screening, evaluation of antioxidant and anti-sickling activities of two polar extracts of Combretum glutinosum leaves. Perr. ex DC
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	Human ethics approval need to be shown as blood is obtained from patients. Otherwise, there are a few errors and suggestions are given as below. Page 2: Line 6, ... comprising of about ... Page 3: last 3rd line, such as peroxy radical... Page 4, line 4, ...to assess (not access).. Section 2.1 Human ethics? Pg 5, Section 2.2 Methods. Do not begin sentence with numeric value. For example Line 1, 60 g can be changed to: Leaves powder 60g of ... Line 5: ...as the one that has been achieved using the ethyl acetate extract Line 6: change codified to 'labeled' Section 2.2.3, line 3: Change 'Indeed 4 mg of DPPH' to DPPH (4 mg) was dissolved ... Pg 6, line 7, change 'deduct' to 'deduced' Section 2.2.4 Line 3 of the paragraph: ...extract, 0.5 mL Folin Ciocalteau 10% (v/v) ... (to remove dluted 1/10th). Section 3 Results Where is the method to evaluate the yield of the extracts. This may be written in the Methods Section. Author gave justification that higher yield is due to	The ethical certificate is given in the attached documents The corrections were made in their respective line Human ethics is given in the attached documents The corrections were made The correction was made The correction was made The correction was made The correction was made Method used to determine the % yield of the extraction is given in the material and method part Because methanol which is more polar than



SDI Review Form 1.6

	polarity of methanol. Why? Present the yield as % only , need not in both grams and % . Any S.D? Was the plants purchased only one time, or a few times at random time of the year. If so, the yield can be expressed in terms of % average $\pm$ S.D. This would give an idea if the methanol and ethyl acetate extracts yield varied significantly. Generally methanol is able to extract a wider range of compounds from polar to semi-polar compounds, compared to ethyl acetate which is non-polar. Page 9, line 2. Change graphic 1 to Figure 1. Add a legend below Table 3, to explain on the abbreviations used. Check the terms on CI, CE and PA. There are mistakes here. Ethical issue: As blood samples are taken from patients, human ethics approval is required and this need to be shown in the article.	ethyl acetate, is able to extract a wider range of compounds from polar to semi-polar compounds, compared to ethyl acetate which is less polar. We did not have the deviation standard because we extracted only one time for each solvent from the leaves powder The plant was purchased only one time. The correction was done We used here the same terms that of those given in reference 21 (Brand Williams 1995) But the PA is replaced by ARP (Antiradical Power). The ethical certificate is given in the attached documents.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Grammatical errors across the article to be revised	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Overall, a good written article on the findings of antioxidant and anti-sicking activities of a medicinal plant.	