



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
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	The anti-sickling activity of <i>Combretum glutinosum</i> was evaluated in the study. While the results appear to be of interest, the following revisions (serious revisions) are recommended for the improvement of the manuscript: 1. Several language and punctuation errors are present throughout the content, e.g. line 7, the full-stop needs to be moved right after 'world' and adjacent to 'In' of the next sentence. 2. The details provided on <i>Combretum glutinosum</i> and its commercial cultivation are insufficient in the Introduction. It is recommended to include more information on the availability of this plant around the world, especially outside of Africa and whether it has the potential to be mass-produced for the demands of the market and the population affected by sickle cell anaemia. 3. A suitable picture of the plant should be included as a Figure for reference and identification purposes. 4. Details of <u>ethical clearance / consent</u> for usage of blood samples for the study is not provided. This is a significant miss and is a must to be included, or if not deemed necessary, proper justifications should be provided for this. 5. Table 1, all percentage numbers should be expressed in two decimal places. 6. Representative raw data from the phytochemical screening should be included in the manuscript. This is of utmost importance since only the presence and/or absence of compounds have been stated in the Results. 7. Standard deviations should be included in the Figures to indicate replicate evaluations. Ethical issue:	1. The full stop in line 7 was moved 2. We did not find the necessity to give all these details in the manuscript, especially as we are not in production or in commercial actions. We simply do a scientific research on a plant used traditionally in our country to manage sickle cell disease. However, some additional informations have been given. 3. We gave in separate page the picture of the plant. The editorial policy in the author's guideline does not require it. 4. The ethical certificate is given in the attached documents 5. The two decimals were made in the percentage 6. The phytochemical screening used in this work is a qualitative test and not quantitative. The technic of thin layer chromatography used here permitted to see the presence or absence of the desired compound in comparison with a reference. 7. The deviation standard was given in the



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Details of obtaining ethical clearance / consent for the usage of blood samples is not provided. This is a significant aspect and should be dealt with prior to acceptance of the manuscript.	graphics. We used here new software (Origin. 8.5) to draw the curve which permit to see the deviation standard. The ethical certificate is given in the attached documents
Minor REVISION comments	None	
Optional/General comments	None	