SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_EJNFS_52786**
Title of the Manuscript:	**In vitro antioxidant activities of hydroethanolic extract of defatted wonderful kola (Buchholzia coriacea) seeds and its safety evaluation in murine models**
Type of the 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'**, .
To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/30/editorial-policy)

SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI 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	Opinion on the work (Ms_EJNFS_52786) entitled: *In vitro* antioxidant activities of hydroethanolic extract od defatted wonderful kola (*Buchholzia coriacea*) seeds and its safety evaluation in murine models". *Buchholzia coriacea* seeds have the following effect on the human body: it is used for treatment of fever, hypertension, cough, stimulate immune system, enhance the memory, facilitates learning, prevent premature ageing, strengthens the nervous system. It is therefore a raw material with extensive biological activity, worth to be thoroughly researched. The Authors focused on the study of the toxicological, antioxidant and antiradical activity of ethanol extract obtained from plant seeds. Many valuable methods was used to determine both antiradical and toxicological properties, which is the strength of the work. It is especially valuable to study the effect of extract on reactive oxygen species. I do not agree with the authors opinion that the extract contains large amount of phenolic compounds (table 1). In my opinion the values presented in table are low. Also antioxidant properties shown in figure 2 are small, activity is much lower than ascorbic acid. When testing the effect of extract on ALT, AST, ALP, bilirubin a tendency was found to increase of these values with an increase in the concentration of the extract. In the case of mice, this effect was even more clear, although no statistical significance of the differences between the samples was observed. I recommend to publish this work after correction suggested by the reviewers. List of comments. 1. line 11 - write $ABTS^{\bullet+}$. 2. line 66 - is the web address of plant list database correct? 3. line 92 (150 µg/mL) what solution? also gallic acid – below. 4. line 119 (10 µg/mL…..) – what solution? the same line 138. 5. line 152 sentence – "Nitric oxide scavengers compete with oxygen….." sentence seems false, please explain. 6. line 161 – how many repetitions? 7. line 243 should be mice not rats. 8. line 288 – should be 2e. 9. line 309 – why biomarkers are written with capital letter? correct throughout. 10. line 335 – why urea and creatinine are written with capital letters? correct throughout. 11. line 366 – why hydroethanolic is written in capital letter. 12. line 351 – should be antioxidant.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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:	**Zbigniew Sroka**
Department, University & Country	**Wrocław Medical University, Poland**