

### 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> Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.	<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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<div>1. Title needs a modification as it is stated in your article discussion part that extracts using other polar solvents like ethanol the antioxidant findings are already established. Title should specify terms to show how your work stands different from what is reported earlier.</div> <div>2. There are many other uses for this plant that have not been specified in introduction part also it is not specified by naming the traditional systems of medicine.</div> <div>3. There seem to be a number of spelling mistakes which spell check etc can rectify so suggesting the use of same. Eg: Hydrolipidemic.</div> <div>4. Regarding the plant authentication, details like authentication number or specimen deposit number etc not provided.</div> <div>5. Year of study and details as to when the plant bark was collected not specified.</div> <div>6. In discussion part phytochemical analysis is counted as one of the three antioxidant methods which seems incorrect so rectify the same.</div>	<div>1. We agree that the title should better reflect the novelty of our work. As highlighted in the discussion our study focuses on the hydromethanolic bark extract so clarify this we have proposed the modified title.</div> <div>2. We have expanded the introduction to include the additional traditional uses of the plant and specified its relevance in traditional medicine systems such as Ayurveda, Siddha, Unani and Homoeopathy. The revised section now highlights its broader therapeutic applications. and highlighted in yellow</div> <div>3. The spell check has been executed on the entire document and relevant corrections have been taken care and highlighted in yellow.</div> <div>4. We have updated the manuscript to include the plant authentication details including the herbarium accession No. and highlighted in yellow.</div> <div>5. We have updated the manuscript to include the year of study and details of the plant bark collection and highlighted in yellow.</div> <div>6. The part of the phytochemical analysis has been removed from the antioxidant methods. The revelent section has been highlighted in yellow.</div>

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)	