Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJBGMB_63967**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Assessment of the inherent in-vitro antioxidant potential of Commelina benghalensis leaf extract**
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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy)

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	**Author missed to provide the details of Vitamin C standard and Quercetin control concentrations in the preparation standards procedure – must be added, but it has mentioned the final conc. used under figure.**	Vitamin C and quercetin only served as standards for the investigation so much emphasis (in terms of concentration) was not required.
Minor REVISION comments	Generally antioxidant studies - researchers try to conclude with data by IC 50 values …. Now the bar diagram is seems non-scientific , but it is not wrong – but can be changed Yu W, Zhao Y, Shu B. The radical scavenging activities of radix puerariae isoflavonoids: A chemiluminescence study. Food Chem. 86(4):525-529. (in this reference year is missing)	Though the determination of IC_{50} is quite important, it was not the crux of the experiment. The bar diagram is scientific enough because the results are expressed as mean ± SEM. The error bars are the SEMs of the means. The year is 2004. Corrected in the manuscript.
Optional/General comments	In conclusion author stated that (Thus the plant is a potent source of antioxidants hence could serve as a cost effective food/feed additive), if no data kept in the manuscript in support of this statement look hard – can be avoided.	The statement has been modified in the manuscript.

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)*	