SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Pharmaceutical Research**
Manuscript Number:	**2013_BJPR_4722**
Title of the Manuscript:	***In vitro* antioxidant potential of *Momordica charantia* fruit extracts**
Type of the Article	**Research paper**

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:
(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.

SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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	1, in 'Materials and Methods', 'Collection of plant material', the fresh Momordica fruit was 'dried in the sunlight for four consecutive days'. This is not a proper way to prepare good material. The process is too long, and lots of compounds can get oxidized. Dry the fruit in the oven at high temperature is a better way to think. 2, in 'Materials and Methods', 'Preparation of extract', the procedure is too long and lots of compounds can get oxidized. 3, in 'Result', 'DPPH redical scavenging assay', 'The most prominent scavenging effect of ethanol and ethyl acetate extracts were 77.65% and 18 73.75% which were comparable to the highest activity (96.86) of scorbic acid.' The concentration of these values should be state. 4, in 'Result', 'Reducing power by FeCl3', the statement is not consist with the number in the figure. 5, the discussion need to be defined. And some results were not carefully analyzed.	
Minor REVISION comments	English need to be improved. The full name of abbreviation DPPH should be state.	
Optional/General comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer