



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	South Asian Research Journal of Natural Products
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SARJNP_46718
Title of the Manuscript:	Antioxidant Potential and anti-sickling activity of different organs of Curcuma longa: effect of total polyphenol content and correlation of the antioxidant capacity on anti-sickling activity
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>)



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>The title "Antioxidant Potential and anti-sickling activity of different organs of Curcuma longa: effect of total polyphenol content and correlation of the antioxidant capacity on anti-sickling activity" is too long and not appropriate. The word organ is not relevant.</p> <p>There is no information about extract of all part of plants and their percentage yield.</p> <p>The methodology written among all experiment is in-complete. Kindly follow the standard protocol.</p> <p>In Table 1: Content of polyphenolic phytoconstituents in different organs of C. longa (mean \pm SD, n = 3) What is the P value? Unable to find the significant results.</p> <p>In line 123-124 if rhizome has significant value then did you compare your results with the literature. Validate your results. Same problem in your results and discussion.</p> <p>in paragraph 159-167, You have discussed environmental factors but there are more than one factor that may result in significant difference. What about physiological factors, phytochemical factors?</p> <p>Figure 1 is inappropriate and randomly present. Kindly put clear pictures.</p> <p>Table 2: How could be the values of gallic acid (control) will be like this? Kindly check your results and send us the supplementary file on Excel sheet.</p> <p>The discussion for table 2 needs more evidence from the literature as a number of literatures is available online.</p> <p>What is Racines in table 3. The results in table 4 are not correct.</p> <p>Table 4: Relationship between polyphenol contents, antioxidant activity and anti-sickling activity?? This is not the way to find the correlation.</p> <p>Where are the statistical test? such as Correlation (Pearson, Kendall, Spearman to find the relationship.</p> <p>Discussion needs more citation from the literature.</p> <p>Perspective and conclusion are both different. Kindly change.</p>	<p>Thanks the title has been corrected.</p> <p>This information has been added as requested.</p> <p>The methodology was rewritten and standard protocols have been followed carefully.</p> <p>The p-value is 5%.</p> <p>This suggestion was good and all the literature requested has been incorporated.</p> <p>We recognized the synergy of different factors playing a specific role. But if reading carefully the physiological factors were also mentioned.</p> <p>Thanks. It is corrected.</p> <p>Yep, it has been corrected.</p> <p>All the literature required to further discuss Table 2 was incorporated, and there is now more evidence.</p> <p>It was a mistake. Racines stands for "roots".</p> <p>More clarity is given in the manuscript.</p> <p>The test of Pearson was used to establish the correlation.</p> <p>More citations have been incorporated in the discussion.</p> <p>All is fine now.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> Yes. Kindly ask the author to submit the supplement statistical excel file	We were willing to submit the excel file as requested in order to check on the validity of our results but unfortunately, the file was corrupted.