

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_124882
Title of the Manuscript:	Quantification of the antiradical potential and evaluation of the antibacterial activity of the stem and root barks of <i>Cassia sieberiana</i> : a plant used in traditional medicine
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The antibacterial activity assessed showed that <i>C. sieberiana</i> stem and root extracts were active against the <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> strains tested. The stem extracts were absolutely bactericidal, while the root extracts were bacteriostatic. <i>C. sieberiana</i> , stems, could be used to treat bacterial infections and diseases linked to oxidative stress. This can be useful for infected people.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Yes, it is comprehensive. Didn't need any addition.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The aim of researcher is good and scientifically correct. The aim of this research is to quantitatively assess the antioxidant activity of aqueous, ethanolic and hydro-ethanolic extracts of <i>Cassia sieberiana</i> stem and root bark, evaluate their antimicrobial activity. This manuscript is technically sound.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Also add some other recent references.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, it is good. You can communicate.	
Optional/General comments	The content of paper is good and suitable for communications.	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Romita Devi
Department, University & Country	MLSM College, India