



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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	Original research papers

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>It should be appreciated the efforts of authors in revision of the manuscript. But, the authors didn't put enough time in improving the manuscript and completely failed to follow the corrections raised last time. The current manuscript severely suffers from the following issues:</p> <p>1) Please try to give the response to the points raised by reviewer in the same fashion (point to point explanation) to avoid confusion.</p> <p>1) The preliminary phytochemical analysis of the extracts was carried out and the results were presented in this manuscript, which were removed in this revised version of manuscript. May I know the reason behind removing the phytochemical data, which has supported the antioxidant activity?</p> <p>2) In the abstract, what the authors mean 'DPPH increases with increase in corresponding concentration'? Most of readers won't get your intention. Make it clear.</p> <p>If DPPH radicals increase in presence of extract, then how it is accounted for its antioxidant activity?</p> <p>3) Similarly in the abstract, what is the meaning of 'The DPPH of the stem bark..'? I hope it should be 'The percentage DPPH radical inhibition ability of stem bark..'</p> <p>4) In the introduction, the last sentence is written wrongly. Please add the word 'ethanolic extracts' in the last sentence so that it mean the activities of fruit and stem bark extracts instead of the parts as such.</p> <p>5) Also add some information or motivation behind selecting only fruit and stem bark of the plant for your study by providing some literature so that it indicates your ideas behind the plant part selection clearly.</p> <p>6) In the Materials section, in addition to the source of the plant material, please add the information about the sources of other important materials used in the study such as DPPH, Ascorbic acid and other chemicals and their purity standards if it requires mentioning for the reproduction of results.</p> <p>7) In the methods, please replace the word 'plant parts' with the plant parts name to convey clearly which parts were used.</p> <p>8) Also, the units for time 'mins' is wrong, which should be 'min'.</p> <p>9) The point rose about the results section last time, but there is no improvement. I suggested writing the results by describing the figures and what it indicates. By looking at the figures, other readers won't get anything from the figures. If it is difficult to write the results in separate, please merge both the headings and write under 'Results and Discussion'.</p> <p>10) Last time I suggested to change the y-axis title from 'DPPH' to '% Inhibition of DPPH', which perfectly describes the results of the assay. Please try to follow the suggestions for improving your manuscript.</p> <p>11) Please make a statement about the extract properties such as color and the % yields for both the fruit and stem bark extracts.</p> <p>12) Again I am suggesting for adding statistical information (t-test) to understand the significance of the results (p-values).</p> <p>13) Finally, the language can be improved in many parts of the manuscript.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

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