



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 (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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	-English language is very poor, please rewrite the paper. - In the text the authors mentioned only three references or the list of references contains 23 references. You must reorder, rewrite or repeat the references. -Any relation between Line 49 in the text and the reference [1]. - Repeat lines number 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 15, 21, 23, 27, 28, 30, 31,36, 57, 59, 60, 61, 62, 67, 86, 71, 72, 74, 76, 78, 79, 82, 86, 88, 104, 135, 136, 166, 167, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 204, 201, 222 and 226.	This is not very clear, the authors are not English speakers and have tried their best to put this in a proper English. The references have been corrected; this seems to have been the issue of formatting on the journal side since the original document that was sent was properly edited. This issue is related to the references issue just discussed above. This is not clear, so it has been left, unattended! The authors would like some clarification here if this is critical to the decision.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	-I recommend that Section Determination of Total Phenolic Content must pouted be before section Determination of Antioxidant Capacity in the text. -Line 117: change, analysed by analyzed -Line 180: change. on comparison of different ... by the comparison of the various parts show	The sections have been rearranged as advised by the reviewer. The authors disagree with the reviewer in this case since the document is written in UK English NOT American English hence analysed is correct. Changed appropriately and highlighted in yellow as advised.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	-Author sometimes write anti-oxidant sometimes antioxidant	Since the reviewer is not making any suggestion, the authors have decided to retain “antioxidants” as one word and corrected those with the hyphen appropriately.