



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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 <i>Simarouba glauca</i> DC (Paradise tree)
New Title of the Manuscript:	PHYTOCHEMICAL IDENTIFICATION AND COMPARATIVE <i>IN-VITRO</i> ANTI-OXIDANT STUDIES OF AQUEOUS, ETHANOL AND METHANOL ROOTBARK EXTRACTS OF <i>Simarouba glauca</i> DC (Paradise tree)
Type of Article:	Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>Previous correction were not done. These observations are still outline below;</p> <p>ABSTRACT</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The content of the study design need to be change; because it's not reflecting the study design. Methodology: Citations are not allowed in this section. Rather use..... 'were evaluated by standard method.' Keywords should be separated by comma and not semicolon. <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Line 5: delete 'and' after family simaroubaceae and use 'are' instead. Citations in introductions are not properly done. For e.g. you start with 1, 2, 3, the next one should be 4 not 18. You can make your botanical classification into a sentence and then insert into line 5. After the common names, this citation was given "Technical Data Report for <i>Simarouba glauca</i> (2002)". Is this a citation or what? If it is, it should be cited properly and should be reflected in the reference list. <p>MATERIALS AND METHODS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Delete the contents of 2.3, 2.3.1 and 2.3.2.; not important. Author should note that this is not project report rather journal article. List of chemicals have no meaning on their own. The usage of each chemical mentioned is best explain in the method where it was used. Consequently, making a list is a kind of tautology. Any one that want to repeat the same work will not look at the list of chemicals, rather will look at the method that make use of the chemicals. Include statistical tool; use statistical tool to compare the findings of the different parameters. Citations in 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 and 2.7 were not correctly done. Italicised <i>Simarouba glauca</i> in lead acetate and 	<p>ABSTRACT</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The study/research falls within the category of a true experimental research. Its impossible to change the kind of study conducted to what seem not existing as the reviewer suggest. The category of research is proposed by the journal and not the author. Noted and effected Noted and effected <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Noted and effected Noted and effected Noted and effected Noted and effected <p>MATERIALS AND METHODS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I insist that young and upcoming researchers and scientists may find the contents of 2.3, 2.3.1 and 2.3.2 useful to conducting related studies. Noted and effected Noted and effected Noted and effected



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

sulphuric acid test.

CITATIONS:

1. Citations in introductions are not properly done. For e.g. you start with 1, 2, 3, the next one should be 4 not 18.
2. No citation for total antioxidant assay.
3. After citation 11, there is no 12 and 15.
4. After citation 17, the next citation was 22. What about 18, 19, 20 and 21.

NB: all citations should be arranged serially.

REFERENCE:

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.**

CITATION

1. **NOTED AND EFFECTED**
2. **NOTED AND EFFECTED**
3. **NOTED AND EFFECTED**
4. **NOTED AND EFFECTED**