



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Pharmaceutical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJPR_21462
Title of the Manuscript:	Antioxidant Activity of the Fruit and Stem bark of <i>Tetrapleura tetraptera</i> Taub (Mimosaceae).
Type of the Article	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>I have the following comments</p> <p>Several minor comments were raised in the pdf file for authors and authors must respond during representation of the article. The major ones were listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Phytochemical screening is not a germane research effort unless accompanied by isolation and characterization of compounds 2. Author to (i) amend the title and (ii) include the plant authority 3. Authors to rewrite the Introduction to include only (i) information about the nature of the plant, its ethnomedical uses, pharmacological and biological activities, volatile and non-volatile compounds obtained from the plant and previous works on DPPH activity 4. Authors to give information about (i) who identified the plant (ii) the herbarium where voucher was kept (iii) herbarium number 5. Remove all information concerning phytochemical analysis because this was not done. Several compounds have been isolated from the plant which makes this effort useless 6. Activities mostly are based on the nature of compounds present in the extract. Authors are advised to involve both polar and non-polar solvents instead of ethanol alone. In this case, there will be comparative data 7. Discussion: Authors to focus on the antioxidant 	The necessary correction have been made.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>discussion by giving information (i) on the data (ii) comparison of data with previous works on the plant or related species in the genus (iii) mechanism by which the plant elicit the property</p> <p>8. Authors to write reference both within the text and the appropriate place in accordance with the style of the journal</p> <p>9. There are several grammatical errors in the manuscript needing revision</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Authors can only resubmit when all required methodology and experiment raised in the comments were concluded.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		