



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJAST_18249
Title of the Manuscript:	Determination of Antioxidants and Total Phenolic Content in Some Wild Vegetables Used Widely in Lesotho
Type of the Article	Short 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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The Abstract, method and discussion need reviews as stated in the reviewed document. Proper numbering of text titles and subtitles Most of the listed References were not cited in the text. Standard referencing format should be followed	Attended appropriately Addressed appropriately. This was a problem of formatting the original document, attended appropriately. However, due to the number of these, they have not been highlighted as advised. Not clear, but the referencing has followed the prescribed guidelines
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	All the sections have typographical errors and punctuations to correct. Use taxonomic names with authorities for all the plants used	Attended as advised; seems it was the issue of formatting yet again. This is not clear since all the plants have been referred using their taxonomic names.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Comparison with known antioxidant ought to have been done.	The advice is noted, however, the proposal will be taken on board in the follow-up study.