

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_82500
Title of the Manuscript:	QUALITATIVE AND QUANTITATIVE DETERMINATION OF SECONDARY METABOLITES AND ANTIOXIDANT POTENTIAL OF CENTAUREA BEHEN L. ROOT EXTRACTS
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

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

(<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Topic: The research is not addressing the quantitative aspect of all secondary metabolites. It deals only with quantitative determination of flavonoids. Hence, I recommend the topic shall be modified as “PHYTOCHEMICAL SCREENING AND QUANTITATIVE DETERMINATION OF FLAVONOIDS AND ANTIOXIDANT POTENTIAL OF <i>CENTAUREA BEHEN</i> L. ROOT EXTRACTS” ✓ Plant material: The author has to authenticate the plant material and voucher specimen with its corresponding specimen number has to be stored in a herbarium. ✓ Defatting and successive extraction: As it stands the procedure is not repeatable. Hence the author has to mention the volume of solvents used for extraction and defatting. The time used for extraction and the temperature at which the extracts were concentrated has to be included. It is not clear that the extraction is successive or effected separately. The authors need to clarify this. ✓ Please modify IC50 as IC₅₀ ✓ The author mix methods with results and discussion. For instance, line 1-4 of the results and discussion is methodology and not results. Please move this section to methods section ✓ One of the major drawbacks of this manuscript is that the results are not discussed. Hence I strongly recommend the author to give detail discussion of phytochemical screening, total flavonoids and antioxidant activity of the extracts of the root of the plant. Furthermore, the correlation of the phytochemical constituents, total flavonoid contents and antioxidant activity is has to be explained. ✓ I recommend the isolation at least some of the major constituents of the root ✓ Therefore this paper is accepted with serious major revision. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer’s comment	Author's comment (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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yadessa Melaku Ayana
Department, University & Country	Adama Science and Technology University, Ethiopia