



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Botany
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIB_50878
Title of the Manuscript:	CONTRIBUTION TO THE STUDY OF LEAVES : AZADIRACHTA INDICA A. Juss (MELIACEAE) : EVALUATION OF THE ANTIOXIDANT ACTIVITY
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>ABSTRACT LINES 12-16: Rephrase this to avoid the use of “To do this, we...” and “Then we...” LINES 24-25: Rephrase this avoiding “The result of this work ...” and “These results ...” Keywords: LINES 31-33: Separate this from keywords as they are definition of terms. LINES 50-52: I suggest you use – “The aim of this research is to explore the antioxidant activity of the leaves of ...”</p> <p>2.1 LINES 59-60: Consider using - :The plant specimen was identified at the botany department of ...</p> <p>2.3 LINE 67: “... powder is” SHOULD BE – powder was</p> <p>LINES 98 – 105: This should be a reported speech and not a suggested procedure.</p> <p>LINE 107: “At ...” SHOULD BE - A_t</p> <p>LINES 112 – 113: Fischer test?</p> <p>LINE 129 Fig 2 & LINE 137 Fig 3: The content were not captured in the methodology but suddenly appear in the result.</p> <p>LINE 141: Delete the phrase “We used ...”</p> <p>LINE 142: simile?</p> <p>DISCUSSION LINES 164 – 171: - This appear more than a methodology. Please rephrase.</p> <p>LINE 172: Consider using – several tests were used, including instead of “We used several test, including ...”</p> <p>LINE 181: Should be revealed a percentage</p> <p>LINE 187: Should be – was low compared to</p> <p>LINES 212: Should be – was low for both ...</p> <p>LINE 219 - 220: There is a missing link</p> <p>LINES 227 – 228: “What joint some including [2, 10]” – Delete this as it has no link with the foregoing.</p> <p>CONCLUSION LINES 230 – 237: Consider using – The leaves of <i>Azadirachta indica</i> A. Juss</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>has a very important antioxidant property. This confirms its acclaimed antimalaria, antibacterial, antiviral and immuno-stimulant properties. This natural product is however an alternative to solving the problems of high cost of synthetic antioxidant products and becomes affordable to the poor. Further studies on the isolation and identification of the antioxidant molecule as well as determination of the acute toxicity of the fruits and stalks of <i>Azadirachta indica</i> A. Juss are suggested.</p> <p>GENERAL: The use of personal pronouns such as “we” especially were used too often. This should be avoided.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Article</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has good title and methodology. • Addresses the current problems of health and poverty in the world. 	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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)</p>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Ogundeko, Timothy Olugbenga</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Bingham University, Jos, Nigeria</p>