



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_IJBCRR_47763 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | COMPARISON OF PHYTOCHEMICAL, IRON CHELATING, AND FREE RADICAL SCAVENGING ACTIVITY OF FRESH RIBES NIGRUM (BLACK CURRANT) AND NUTRACEUTICAL C24/7 |
| 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>Introduction: concise and clear.</p> <p>2.0 Materials and Methods Fresh <i>Ribesnigrum</i> was bought from terminus market located at Jos, Plateau State, Nigeria in June 2017 - why June ? and not other season ? dry season ? wet season ? justify , please</p> <p>2.1 Plant extraction About 20g of fresh <i>Ribesnigrum</i> was washed under running water properly and the seeds were removed manually, and then the fleshy part of the fruit was homogenized using an electrical blender and macerated with 75ml of ethanol for 15 minutes and then filtered through Whatman No 1 filter paper. The filtrate was condensed using rotary evaporator and the extract was stored at 4°C. Why this extractor/solvent ? if you use other condition... in 70% ethanol (source ? Merck, aldrich ? purity ?). A maceration is normally do it by weeks. Please, review your extraction conditions.</p> <p>2.2 Phytochemical Screening (Qualitative) You are clear, qualitative, but not quantitative. All these tests are very preliminary. They are used normally in pharmacognosy undergraduate courses. Unfortunately, you have "only" a idea of the composition your extract. Besides, qualitative tests are unprecise. Ethanol is not a good solvent for some tests you did (it is a solubility question). Please, review that. Discussion: The argumentation is totally correct, but the experimental evidences do not help us to conclude all these results. 5 Conclusion: <i>Modest, please improve it</i> REFERNCES: <i>I would like to see more references from 2015-2018... certainly they can help you to ratify more all your argumentations.</i></p> <p>Tables: Table 2: Percentageconcentration (mean± SD) and wavelength of quantified phytochemicals <i>if you use %, please , your accuracy cannot be so good.</i></p> <p>Final comments: <i>The idea of this work is very good, but the experimental part is very modest. The argumentation is good. The references are consistent, but they need to be updated. This work has a good potential, but a chromatographic analysis is necessary to affirm with more consistence all results.</i></p> | |
| Minor REVISION comments | | |
| Optional/General comments | | |

PART 2:

| | 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) |
|---|--|---|
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | Marcelo Barcellos Da Rosa |
| Department, University & Country | Federal University of Santa Maria, Brazil |