

Journal Name:	Asian Basic and Applied Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ABAARJ_1781
Title of the Manuscript:	Flavonoid/Phenol content Ratios in Aspilia africana (Wild sunflower) Methanolic Extracts: Implications for Oxidative Stress Management.
Type of the Article	

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	As it advances knowledge of plant-derived antioxidants, especially phenolics and flavonoids, in the management of oxidative stress, this manuscript is of great significance to the scientific community. It demonstrates the potential of various plant parts in preventing oxidative stress-related illnesses like cancer, neurological diseases, and cardiovascular ailments by examining the flavonoid/phenolic content ratios in Aspilia africana methanolic extracts. The results offer important information for the creation of plant-based medicinal agents, particularly the strong antioxidant capacity of the root and the leaf's abundance of flavonoids. In addition to highlighting Aspilia africana's therapeutic benefits, this study promotes more investigation into the plant's bioactive components for use in pharmaceutical and nutraceutical applications.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	In general, the article's title, "Flavonoid/Phenol content Ratios in Aspilia africana (Wild sunflower) Methanolic Extracts: Implications for Oxidative Stress Management," is appropriate; nonetheless, it should be made clearer and better.	

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.	<p>The abstract provides a straightforward summary of the study and is generally thorough. It might, however, need a little polish and a better organized presentation to improve attention and clarity. Here are some ideas for enhancements, although assessing phenolic and flavonoid levels is important, the abstract does not specifically define the goal of the study. "This study aimed to quantify the total phenolic and flavonoid contents in different parts of <i>Aspilia africana</i> and evaluate their potential antioxidative properties through F/P ratios," for example, would give a clearer backdrop. Simplify and Prioritize Findings, without repeating the exact facts several times, the findings could be more concisely described.</p>	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	<p>The technique, analysis, and interpretation of the findings in the manuscript seem to be in line with scientific principles. However, access to the complete manuscript—including the introduction, materials and methods, results, discussion, and conclusion—would be necessary for a thorough evaluation. The text highlights the function of flavonoids and phenolics in oxidative stress regulation and is based on accepted scientific concepts.</p> <p>Total phenolic and flavonoid contents can be measured using spectrophotometric techniques, which is a reliable and popular method. The manuscript's credibility is increased by the inclusion of quantitative data (such as flavonoid-to-phenol (F/P) ratios and mg GAE/g values for phenolic content). Make sure the spectrophotometric process, including calibration curves, controls, and reproducibility, is well explained in the techniques section.</p> <p>Check to see if the F/P ratio computations are justified and explained in light of their biological significance.</p> <p>Throughout the manuscript, make sure that terminology like "phenolic content," "flavonoid content," and "antioxidative potential" are defined and utilized consistently.</p> <p>It is important to carefully match the data presented with the conclusions on the extracts' antioxidative capability. The claims would be further supported if comparisons with established benchmarks or standards (such as ascorbic acid or other antioxidants) were made.</p> <p>To emphasize its distinctive contributions, the manuscript could benefit from contrasting the findings with those of related studies on <i>Aspilia africana</i> or other plants. Throughout the manuscript, make sure that terminology like "phenolic content," "flavonoid content," and "antioxidative potential" are defined and utilized consistently.</p>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Good	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Good	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Theeranat Suwanaruang
Department, University & Country	Thailand