



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJPAC_47673
Title of the Manuscript:	Determination of Antioxidant activity of Leave extracts of Albizia chevaieri using free Radical Scavenging activity assay
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>On this report, authors shown a potential antioxidant activity for <i>A. chevaieri</i> laves' extracts. There are several question on the report that must be observed, mainly on Experimental and Results and Discussion section:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Discussion section must be separated in order to explain first, the sequence of solvents on the extraction; second, why is important the study of antioxidant properties of <i>A. chevaieri</i> considering that several others plants into the same family have the same properties; comparison of the antioxidant power of <i>A. chevaieri</i> compared with the other <i>Albizia</i> species cited by the authors. 2. Please make a review of the correct writing, there are inconsistencies for example: authors write <i>Albizia chevaieri</i> on the title, meanwhile write <i>Albizia chevalieri</i>, <i>Albizia checalieri</i>, <i>A. chevalieri</i> along the manuscript, also with italics or not. Please homologate it. 3. On Discussion section explain the selection of used solvents. I do consider that you must, for example, do a direct extraction of leaves with chloroform because after ethanol extract, you are missing lot of non-polar material solved in chloroform but not in ethanol. 4. In the Experimental section, the first extraction during 14 days was made at room temperature?, please include information in the manuscript. 5. In the same section, I do consider that experiment must be made at least with three different collection, not on only one. 6. Your 100% of scavenging activity must be the DPPH 1mM completely reduced. Is there a way to do it in that way? 7. How much increases the cero (basal) measurement with the different concentrations of the extracts?, I feel worried because of the colour (dark green, black) which could interfere with the spectrophotometric measurement, overall at the higher concentrations. 8. Yield calculated is wrong. The first calculation on the ethanolic extract is correct (5.11%) because is calculated in comparison with the 150 gr of leaves, however the following calculations create a wrong perception (21.66, 28.16 and 17.5%). Please made calculation as the first one, using the 150g as 100%. Also that information must be included in table 1 as another column 9. Title on table 2, say "Antioxidant activity...", whereas the rest of manuscript this is presented as "radical scavenging activity". Please homologate. 10. Table 2 content the results of activity from the different extracts. According with authors, the experiment was made by triplicate, however the numbers have not any dispersion. These numbers represents media?, where is the SD or SE?. 11. Table 2 contents the same information that figure 2 and the same that figure 3. Also these figures were made with very bad quality. Considering that the mentioned figures are redundant, authors must consider seriously eliminate them. 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>12. The same situation occurs with table 3 and figure 4. Authors included the same information on the text (lines 162-167), on the table 3 and the same information is presented in figure 4. Choose only one way to present the information.</p> <p>13. The calculation of inhibitory concentration 50 (IC50) seems so strange. According to me, IC represents the amount (Concentration) that inhibits activity at 50%, so please explain what means -1.87? or -0.81?, means that you have to take out the reagent?, a negative number means that something is wrong with the calculation. Please correct it.</p> <p>14. Must be so illustrative for the manuscript if authors made a discussion; according their experience and knowledge what kind of compounds could be contained in each extract.</p> <p>15. According authors, these plants contains phenols that could be the scavenger molecules so, why did not used a phenolic compound as standard for the determinations?</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Please separate the Discussion section and improve it according the previous comment	
Optional/General comments	Results are redundant in the different ways they are presented. Consider to avoid the redundancy and improve the quality of figures.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Eduardo Martinez-Abundis
Department, University & Country	Juarez Autonomous University of Tabasco, México