



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>This manuscript describes the comparative potential of fruit and stem bark ethanolic extracts of <i>T. Tetraptera</i> for antioxidant activity. This swas an interesting study if the experimental design was reasonable and the objectives were achieved. But, this manuscript needs to be improved a lot in different sections.</p> <p>The manuscript can be improved in its language & writing. It is very difficult to understand in its current form.</p> <p>1) First, the full name of the plant name was not mentioned anywhere in the manuscript. Eg. Tetrapleura tetraptera (Schum & Thonn) Taubert. It will be difficult for the readers to choose the right plant species.</p> <p>2) What the authors mean 'phytochemical activities ..' in line-5, page-1</p> <p>3) In line-12, what the authors mean to say DPPH of 28%..? why it is in percentage and indicates what ?</p> <p>4) The Flow of the discussion of results is confusing. In the abstract the phytochemical analysis was written in the last section while the same was discussed in first then follows the the antioxidant activity. Please make sure which results motivated the next.</p> <p>5) The recent literature is missing. There are many reports describing the anti-diabetic and antioxidant activities of</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>the same plant extracts in vivo. But, the study completely failed to follow the recent literature. For instance : http://pharmacologia.com/abstract.php?doi=pharmacologia.2012.397.405 & Jordan Journal of Biological Sciences;Dec2014, Vol. 7 Issue 4, p251.</p> <p>6) The entire Introduction section was written very poorly. There was any introduction to the plant and its conventional uses, medicinal uses. The motivational literature behind your objectives was not written. Please rewrite the introduction so that there will be some basic information about the plant including the geographical source, ethnomedical uses and the reported literature.</p> <p>7) Its quite surprising that how someone can use the plant without proper authentication from respective botanical head? Please provide an authentication statement for the plant parts used.</p> <p>8) In the methods section, Reducing property & DPPH scavenging assay should be written under 2.4, 2.5 sections to avoid confusions with the 2.3 section of preliminary analysis.</p> <p>9) Why the authors need an heading like 'RESULTS' to show only their figures? The readers won't understand everything from the figure. The authors should write and describe the findings in the 'Results' section.</p> <p>Please write and describe your findings in the results</p>	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>section.</p> <p>10) The figure titles were same for Figure1 & 2, for Figure-3 &4. If you don't need two figures for the same findings please remove one & keep only one suitable one.</p> <p>11) What the authors mean DPPH on the y-axis legend of Figure-3 & 4? Is it indicates the % inhibition or the copncentartion of DPPH?</p> <p>12) Similarly, in Figure-3 & 4 , the x-axis legend written as 'Conc in mg/ml'. Whether it indicates the concentration of extract or DPPH? Please make sure the details are provided in legend itself or the figure legends.</p> <p>13) The statistical analysis is missing in the study. Whether the results are represented as means or single experiment results? Please represent the results as Mean \pmSEM or SD.</p> <p>Also I recommend you to perform statistical analysis like student's-test or ANOVA as applicable to your interest.</p> <p>14) The discussion section can be improved a lot if you incorporate the recent literature on this plant.</p> <p>15) Some parts of the manuscript contain the copied content as identified by 'PLAGIARISM' detection software.</p> <p>Please write the manuscript on your own words to not imitate one's ideas, which is not acceptable by the community.</p>	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1) In line-11, page-1, the fruit ascorbic acid equivalents were written in an open bracket. Plz close that bracket.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Upendarrao Golla
Department, University & Country	Department of Biological Sciences, Indian Institute of Science Education and Research Bhopal (IISERB), India