



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Pharmaceutical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJPR_21462
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Phytochemical Screening and Antioxidant Activity of the Fruit and Stem bark of Tetrapleura tetraptera
Type of the 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> 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>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ines Maria Costa Brighente
Department, University & Country	Department of Chemistry, Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Brazil