Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_EJMP_39220**
Title of the Manuscript:	**PHYTOCHEMICAL ANALYSES AND COMPARATIVE IN-VITRO ANTI-OXIDANT STUDIES OF AQUEOUS, ETHANOL AND METHANOL ROOTBARK EXTRACTS OF Simarouba glauca DC (Paradise tree)**
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	**All observations and suggestions that need to be corrected were made in the manuscript. Author should address them one after the other. For the purpose of emphasis, the following areas need to be addressed:** **Abstract:** **1. The content of the study design need to be change; because it's not reflecting the study design.** **2. Methodology: Citations are not allowed in this section. Rather use ..... 'were evaluated by standard method.' See the manuscript for further suggestions and corrections.** **3. Write DPPH, ABTS$^+$ and BHT in full since they're appearing for the first time, followed by the acronym in bracket.** **4. Keywords should be separated by comma and not semicolon.** **Introduction:** **1. The introduction should be allowed to flow; don't break it into sub-sections like antioxidants and botanical description.** **2. Other suggestions were made in the manuscript.** **3. At the end of the introduction, briefly highlight the basic objectives of the study.** **4. Citations in introductions are not properly done. For e.g. you start with 1, 2, 3, the next one should be 4 not 18.** **Methods:** **1. Delete the contents of 2.3, 2.3.1 and 2.3.2.; not necessary.** **2. Include statistical tool; use statistical tool to compare the findings of the different parameters.** **Results:** **1. Separate results from discussion.** **2. The result did not reflect any comparative study as no statistical measure was used.** **Discussion:** **1. All the parameters of the findings were not at all discuss.** **2. Author should compare each parameter of their findings with previous reports.** **References:** **1. All the references need to be formatted in line with the requirement of the journal. Check author's guidelines of the journal for detail.** **NB: Author should note that these are not the only observations made. Most of the observations were made on the manuscript.**	Noted Noted These have earlier been written in full in the section that houses the chemicals used for anti-oxidant studies This was done for easy assimilation for researchers who wish to consult our work for botanical and plant science studies. The objectives where highlighted Noted These section will help upcoming researchers and scientist including undergraduate and post-graduate students who wish to consult our work for further and to improve their studies, work or thesis. Statistical measure was not the bases of comparison, rather, the potential effect of individual solvent extracts including water extract on free radicals. However, elementary statistical analysis was carried out (Mean and Standard Deviation). It was evidently clear from the results of the IC_{50} the extract that was more or less effective. Noted. Noted.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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