

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_131492
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of in vitro Antioxidant Potential of Terminalia arjuna (Roxb. ex DC.) Wight & Arn. Bark Extract
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

#### General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

**Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.**

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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

[Review Form 3](#)

**PART 1:** Comments

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b> <b>Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The idea of application of using natural antioxidant rich compound as a feed ingredient or in medicated feed for livestock is good. The Terminalia arjuna bark is very well known medicinal tree in indian medicinal system.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	As author is targeting application as feed ingredient for livestock, thus the title should be modified accordingly. It should be "Evaluation of <i>in-vitro</i> Antioxidant Potential of <i>Terminalia arjuna</i> (Roxb. ex DC.) Wight & Arn. Bark Extract as livestock feed ingredient"	Thank you for your suggestion. Since our study is focused on <i>in vitro</i> antioxidant evaluation of the hydromethnolic bark extract of <i>Terminalia arjuna</i> and does not include <i>in vivo</i> trials so the suggested title is not justifiable and could lead to confusion about the specific focus of the study. Hence it might not be possible to accept the suggested title for this paper.
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Author should write objective (as T. arjuna bark as feed ingredient has been unexplored ) and also emphasized on the results as well as give some recommendation of doses of bark.	We appreciate your recommendation to include objective related to <i>Terminalia arjuna</i> bark as a feed additive and provide dosage recommendations. However. Since our study is focused on <i>in vitro</i> antioxidant evaluation of the hydromethnolic bark extract of <i>Terminalia arjuna</i> and does not include <i>in vivo</i> trials or dose-response studies, it would be beyond the scope of the current work to suggest the specific dosages for live stock. We have however suggested that future <i>in vivo</i> research could help determine optimal dosages and efficacy in animal models. We have also included a few studies which can give us idea about some recommended dose.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	As it is well know that T. arjuna bark is rich in tannin and other phytoconstituents which contributes to the antioxidant potential of the bark. The author has not given any new information. Author gave only qualitative data of phytoconstituents and no quantitative data of total phenol, total flavonoid, total tannin, total triterpenoids etc. which may be correlated with the antioxidant and reducing power. Author did not give any data on the doses of T. bark as feed ingredient which is the main objective of the paper. Why did author not attempted other test for antioxidants such as DPPH, ABTS which may give more strength to the manuscript? The Author gave very casual discussion which is not sufficient for the manuscript in present form. Has author found any data of T. bark application as feed ingridient which should also be given during discussion? Author should give standard curve scavenging activity and reducing power activity of standard ascorbic acid.	1. We agree that <i>Terminalia arjuna</i> bark is rich in phytoconstituents that contribute to its antioxidant potential. However the focus of our study was primarily on qualitative phytochemical screening and in vitro antioxidant evaluation. 2. Since our study is focused on <i>in vitro</i> antioxidant evaluation of the hydromethnolic bark extract of <i>Terminalia arjuna</i> and does not include <i>in vivo</i> trials or dose-response studies, it would be beyond the scope of the current work to suggest the specific dosages for live stock. 3. We have revised the discussion part to incorporate references to relevant studies that explore <i>Terminalia arjuna</i> bark as a feed ingredient and provided more comprehensive interpretation of our findings.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Author should include recent literature reference as per the objective of the paper.	We have included recent literature references and highlighted in yellow.
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Good.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)	