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REVIEWER’S REPORT-Edmund Nartey

Major Compulsory Revisions:
1. A positive control should be used in the methods to compare the activity of the plant extract to a known/standard anti-angiogenic agent.
2. There should be HPLC analysis of the extract.
3. The voucher specimen number/reference should be cited after identification.
4. The percentage yield after extraction should be stated and the storage conditions of the extract mentioned including its shelf usage.
5. Were any phyto-chemical tests done to confirm the presence of flavonoids in the extract after extraction? Or otherwise cite the reference text for the extraction method used.
6. Were statistical analysis done to compare the incubation time (48hr with 72hr) for the different doses of the extract. This should be clearly indicated in the figures before any conclusion on time-dependency.
7. The figures showed only statistical comparisons between individual extract concentrations and the control. There must be statistical analysis between the various concentrations (eg. 40 µg/mL to 80 µg/mL etc) before any conclusion on dose-dependency.

Minor Essential Revisions
1. Insert the address of the software manufacturer used in the statistical analysis
2. Insert List of abbreviations in the appropriate section
3. Insert the reference text in
   • Background Line 6 after “.....side effects”
   • Background Line 6 after” .....drug resistance”
4. In Methods- In-vitro scratch assay: Rephrase the 1st and 2nd sentences.
5. In general the Results Section should be re-written so as not to repeat the Methods in the Results Section.
6. The results should not include statements which could have being in the discussion eg. The 1st paragraph of the results sub-section “The relationship between leukocyte infiltration count and formation of blood vessels”
7. Abbreviations should for the first time be stated in full text.
8. The citation of references in Results is not appropriate.
9. In figure 1 the meanings of the asterisks (*) and **) should be clearly stated as done for the other figures.
10. The values stated in the Results Section were Mean ± SEM but in the Methods Section (under statistical analysis) they were supposed to be Mean ± SD.
11. Rephrase the section “Chick chorioallantoic membrane (CAM) assay” to clearly indicate the age of the chick embryos before experimentation and the duration of the various incubation.

Discretionary Revisions
Change the word “fluid” in Preparation of TF-SB from Scutellaria barbata D. Don to “infusion”.

Level of interest
An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English
Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited in grammar especially in the use of tenses throughout the manuscript.

Statistical review
No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician. I have assessed the statistics in my report

Declaration of competing interests
I declare that I have no competing interests

What next?
Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions
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