



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">British Journal of Pharmaceutical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJPR_21462
Title of the Manuscript:	Antioxidant Activity of the Fruit and Stem bark of Tetrapleura tetraptera 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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>The corrections were made in the manuscript, which is attached. The corrections are highlighted in yellow and comments are in the balloons.</p> <p>line 12 -page 1 – “The DPPH for .... to 28.26%...” This % refers to antioxidant activity or % of DPPH? Improve the wording.</p> <p>Lines 74, 80 and 86 – pages 4 and 5: I think the Table 1 and Figures 1 and 3 are not necessary.</p> <p>Line 129 - page 7 - The authors could compare the antioxidant activity of different extracts (fruit and stem). They could even compare the antioxidant activity evaluated by two different tests.</p>	Corrections have been made.
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments		
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		