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Reviewer's report:

I have gone through the manuscript and my comments are as follows:
1. The scope of the manuscript is clearly define and the title is appropriate; the methods chosen are suitable and had been successfully conducted by other researchers in the same field; the data obtained contributed knowledge on the role of this medicinal plant as an effective natural antioxidant; the discussion and conclusion are well balanced.

2. The manuscript is well written and the abstract conveys what the authors have found.

3. Minor amendments:
   i) Results; In vitro antioxidant assays
      The order of DPPH radical scavenging activity and superoxide radical scavenging activity listed AFC as one of the fractions tested. What is AFC?? Is it the same as ARR?
   ii) Results; Phosphomolybdate assay
      The order of result listed ELR. What is ELR?
   iii) Discussion; Paragraph 2
      Thus, our results suggested that………………………………………., as some of the fractions showed highest scavenging ability than that of synthetic compounds.
      What do you mean by synthetic compound in this sentence? I could not find any use of synthetic material in this work except for the standards used ie. ascorbic acid and rutin. If the authors are referring to these standards, please re-consider your suggestion as none of the data (based on table 3) support this statement. All EC50 values for the fractions were much higher than the standards.
   iv) Discussion; Sentence 6
      Minor typo-spelling error, Qur # Our??

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable
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