



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">British Journal of Pharmaceutical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJPR_6989
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative and synergistic phytochemical composition and antioxidant activities of Psidium guajava (stem bark) and Aloe barbadensis (leaf)
Type of the Article	Research paper

**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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Synergism is defined as</b> value/effect greater than the sum of the individual. The data presented, however, fails to justify this principle. Hence the interpretation of the results is erroneous.</p> <p><b>Eg: Antioxidant property- A.vera:3.82, Guava: 0.056 and Combination: 0.15 (As per Table 2). Though in the text the figure stated is 0.5 for the combination. Nevertheless both are less than the additive figure. It appears therefore there is antagonism and not synergism.</b></p>	<p>Synergism is not strictly by definition what you have defined it to be (Breitinger, 2012) as so many models have been proposed to interpret the term.</p> <p>The example cited by your definition is synergistic because the lower the figure the more active in free radical scavenging see lines 277 and 278. The paper has been rewritten. My data confirm 0.15 which is stated in table 2. It has been noted and corrected.</p>
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments		
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	As the interpretation of results is not supported by the data, the paper needs thorough rewriting.	