

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Biochemistry Research &amp; Review</a>
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

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	This manuscript has a scientific significance because it highlights the therapeutic virtues of <i>Cassia sieberiana</i> through its antioxidant and antibacterial potential. A plant that has a strong antioxidant potential has the ability to scavenge free radicals, which is the source of several cardiovascular diseases that is a recurring problem nowadays	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No problem for the 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.	Yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	at the level of the 2. Material and method please correct the numbering 2.1.4, it's more like 2.1.3 review the title of this part 2.2.1 instead of acquisition .... We could put preparation of the different extracts because you describe the process of obtaining your extracts	
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.	This work respects the rules of scientific writing of an article -The results are clearly presented and well-illustrated, and meet the objectives described in the introduction. These results are well illustrated by various tables, graphic, picture and discuss -This work constitutes a scientific contribution in the field of research, it allows to justify, and understand the use of <i>Cassia sieberiana</i> in traditional medicine and its effect on the management of certain bacterial infections.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are not recent enough, the most recent is from 2016 but this does not detract from the quality of the document which is well structured and very explicit	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The article is very interesting because it addresses a subject that is more topical in the world of scientific research, only the references are not very recent	

### **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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Traore Mariam</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>LABIOCA University, Burkina -Faso</b>