





REVIEW FORM

The Editorial Team of the Tropical Journal of Natural Product Research kindly request you to review the enclosed article. Please complete the form and return to the Editor-in-Chief, editor.tjnpr@gmail.com; editor.tjnpr@uniben.edu

A. MANUSCRIPT

Journal	Tropical Journal of Natural Product Research
Manuscript Number	
Type of paper	
Title of paper	THE POTENTIAL ANTIOXIDANT OF MUNDAR LEAVES (Garcinia forbesii King.) n-HEXANE FRACTION FROM INDONESIA
Name of Authors	

B. REVIEWER'S SPECIFIC COMMENTS PER SECTION OF MANUSCRIPT

Abstract	-
Introduction	Research objectives need to be adjusted to the content of the research
Methodology	The authors should write the methodology clearly
Results	It need an explanation of what the circles on the chromatogram mean, as well as the scale next to the chromatogram.
Discussion	Discussions need to be carried out comprehensively.
Conclusion	-
References	Please correct the references as per the journal's guidelines
Figures, Tables	The figures are blurred. Please improve the quality of the figure.

C. REVIEWER'S GENERAL COMMENTS AND REMARKS

1.	The authors are requested to focus on the presentation and language.

D. REVIEWER'S RECOMMENDATION Please mark with "**X**" one of the options.

You state the article should:

Publish as it is	
Accept with minor revisions (editor will check), specific comments to the editor below	
Accept with moderate revisions as recommended by reviewer (X)	
Accept with major corrections (the article should be thoroughly changed)	
Full article	
Short communication	
Reject for reasons noted by the reviewer (please be specific)	

E. REVIEWER'S INFORMATION

Name
Official title
Affiliation
Specialization
Country
E-mail
Phone
Signature



REVIEW FORM

The Editorial Team of the Tropical Journal of Natural Product Research kindly request you to review the enclosed article. Please complete the form and return to the Editor-in-Chief, editor.tjnpr@gmail.com; editor.tjnpr@uniben.edu

A. MANUSCRIPT

Journal	Tropical Journal of Natural Product Research
Manuscript Number	AP100AR
Type of paper	
Title of paper	THE POTENTIAL ANTIOXIDANT OF MUNDAR LEAVES (Garcinia forbesii King.) n-HEXANE FRACTION
	FROM INDONESIA
Name of Authors	N/A

B. REVIEWER'S SPECIFIC COMMENTS PER SECTION OF MANUSCRIPT

Abstract	No comments
Introduction	The focus of this research is related to the antioxidant properties of Mundar. However, there is lack
	of information which address issues such as why the antioxidant activity of Mundar should be
	studied.
Methodology	The formula showed in the section of "The antioxidant activity" is stated by the author to calculate
	the IC50 value. This is considered incorrect because this formula can only calculate the %inhibition
	and NOT the IC50 value.
	It is also important to mention the concentrations of the standard quercetin in this part of the
	method.
Results	In the results section, there is a table showing a side-by-side presentation of antioxidant activity as
	well as the IC50 value of quercetin and n-hexane fraction of G. forbesii. However, the quercetin
	should be presented using line chart so that we could see the linearity as well as the standard
	equation of quercetin.
	Reviewer also noticed that the n-hexane fraction have been set into certain gradient of
	concentrations. This can be assumed that the authors used Probit analysis to calculate the IC50 of
	the n-hexane fraction.
Discussion	The author stated:
	"Based on the calculation of the IC50 value, it can be seen that the n-hexane fraction of G. forcesii
	leaves has an IC50 value of 26.07 ppm which identifies it as a strong antioxidant"
	The category of antioxidant strength mentioned in this part should be based on a reference. Thus,
	we encourage the author to cite any information to support this statement.
Conclusion	No comments
References	Please add more references about <i>G. forbesii</i> to support this study.
Figures, Tables	Figures are presented well and clear. Table 2 should be revised as commented above.

C. REVIEWER'S GENERAL COMMENTS AND REMARKS

English translations should be checked thoroughly. Some grammatical errors can still be found. Some of the noticed words should be consider to be checked again: - Simplicia/simplicial - remaseration (found in section: <i>The G. forbesii leaves methanol extract</i>) - "predict" should be "predicted" - "connect" should be "connected" - etc.	

D. REVIEWER'S RECOMMENDATION Please mark with "**X**" one of the options.

You state the article should:

Publish as it is	
Accept with minor revisions (editor will check), specific comments to the editor below	
Accept with moderate revisions as recommended by reviewer	
Accept with major corrections (the article should be thoroughly changed)	
Full article	
Short communication	
Reject for reasons noted by the reviewer (please be specific)	

E. REVIEWER'S INFORMATION

Name
Official title
Affiliation
Specialization
Country
E-mail
Phone
Signature