



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBcRR_23974
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative DPPH (2, 2-Diphenyl-1-Pycrylhydrazyl) Radical Scavenging Activity of Five Indigenous Herbal Plants and their Polyherbal Extract
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	Abstract: Rephrase the statement starting with "From" (see highlighted section in the main manuscript). You can replace it with: "GPHT had the least value of 1.15 μL followed by <i>Zingiber officinale</i> (18.0 μL), <i>Nauclea Latifolia</i> (46.0), <i>Khaya senegalensis</i> (52.17 μL), <i>Camellia sinensis</i> (56.83 μL), and <i>Phyllanthus spp</i> (67.57 μL) from the estimated median inhibitory concentration IC_{50}"	Correction has been effected on the main manuscript.
Minor REVISION comments	Line 30: Introduce the word "and effect" after "size" as highlighted in the manuscript. Table 1: Have the results been done in triplicates? If yes, then, report the results in the table as either Mean $\pm$SEM or Mean $\pm$SD.	Correction has been effected on the manuscript. The median inhibitory concentration was not done in triplicates.
Optional/General comments	A good demonstration of the antioxidant activities of the five plants in comparison to the Poly herbal extract has been demonstrated by the author. Recent studies have been well cited and few previous studies have also been included in this study. The discussion is well addressed and referred accordingly.	