



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_50346
Title of the Manuscript:	Antioxidant and Hepatoprotective Properties from the Extract and Fractions of <i>Annona senegalensis</i> Pers (Annonaceae) Stem Bark Grown in Nigeria
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>)

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>This work demonstrates that <i>A. senegalensis</i> stem bark has antioxidant properties by scavenging free radicals, decreasing lipid peroxidation and increasing the endogenous blood antioxidant enzymes levels. The antioxidant and hepatoprotective activities are due to the presence of bioactive compounds like flavonoids, phenolics, steroids and tannins. Scientifically robust work, important results were obtained but with miscellaneous discrepancies predominantly of formally character. For more details see yellowed notes directly in the manuscript.</p> <p>For instance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the denomination of ethyl acetate should be unified in all text - please, define more exactly what do you mind with superscript ^{a, b, c, d} in all Tables 4 – 6. 	
Minor REVISION comments	For minor revision see yellowed notes directly in the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments	Well written manuscript without an objective discrepancy – see above. I recommend the manuscript in this form for publication but only after small but important revision.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Miloslav Milichovsky</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University of Pardubice, Czech Republic</i>