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Reviewer’s report:

In the present study, the authors evaluated in vitro antioxidant potential of Dicaliptera roxburghiana. The manuscript was well documented, however, it needs some corrections. After those corrections it can be accepted as regular manuscript. These corrections were listed below:

1. In Background: After the sentence of “The positive outcome by intake … epidemiological studies” the following both related references should be given: “Antioxidant activity and polyphenol content of cherry stem (Cerasus avium L.) determined by LC-MS/MS. Food Research International, (2013), 51(1), 66-74” and “(2012). Antioxidant activity of food constituents-An overview. Archives of Toxicology, 86 (3), 345-396” should be given.

2. At the end of section of “Evaluation of total polyphenolic contents” the following actual reference should be given: “Polyphenol contents and in vitro antioxidant activities of lyophilized aqueous extract of kiwifruit (Actinidia deliciosa). Food Research International, (2011), 44 (5), 1482-1489”.

3. At the same manner, at the end of section of “Reducing power assay” the following related reference should be given: “Pomological features, nutritional quality, polyphenol content analysis and antioxidant properties of domesticated and three wild ecotype forms of raspberries (Rubus idaeus L.). Journal of Food Science, (2011), 76(4), C585–C593.”.

Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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