



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Journal Name:	<u>Chemical Science International Journal</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_42051
Title of the Manuscript:	In Vitro Evaluation of Antioxidant and Anti-inflammatory Properties of Methanol and Dichloromethane Extracts of the Leaf of Globimetula oreophila
Type of the Article	Original 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>)



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	The aim of the paper is to determine the anti-inflammatory and antioxidant activities of extracts and fractions obtained from dried leaves of <i>Globimetula oreophila</i>. The idea of the work is new since there are practically no literature data considering biological activity of this plant. The statistical analysis, however, does not lead to any significant conclusions regarding the analyzed plant material and its possible application. The experimental part lacks numerous data important for repetition of the work and verification of its scientific soundness. The work lacks proper discussion - the obtained results are simply described with no mention of any possible implications and impact of the experimental observations. The paper is also written in poor English with many broken fragments and typing errors (I strongly recommend using of a professional proofreading service). The main problem are the incorrect values of IC₅₀ results in DPPH and NO tests, impossible to obtain or obtained by extrapolation. In my opinion, the presented manuscript should be rejected, but could be reconsidered for publication after carrying out appropriate analyzes, that are necessary for correct determination of IC₅₀ values. The comments for Authors are included in the reviewed electronic version of the manuscript.	The observations are noted and efforts have been made to address issues raised. The IC₅₀ of fractions GDF1, GDF2, GDF3, GDF4, GDF5 and GDF9 were not determine because the values were well over 1000µg/ml which cannot be determined by extrapolation. The graph of GO2 and GMF2 have corrected and IC₅₀ recalculated as pointed out. 1. The required information in line 96 of the PDF of the original article is given in lines 97 – 104. 2. We used rutin because we had no problem dissolving it in our previous studies, so we decided to continue to use rutin. 3. The issues on IC50 has been attend to and the new values highlighted in the version 1 of the manuscript.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Please check the attached file (the reviewed version of the manuscript).	