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| **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.** | This manuscript provides a comparative analysis of the antioxidant, cytotoxic, and anti-inflammatory properties of different extracts from *Cassia sophera* and *Jatropha curcas*. By evaluating various solvents and plant parts, the study highlights specific extract combinations with significant bioactivity, supporting their potential as sources of natural therapeutic agents. The findings contribute to the growing body of research on plant-based pharmacology and offer valuable insights for future drug development and phytochemical investigations. | Noted |
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