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The authors tested many plants for their potential antioxidant, anti-wrinkle and skin whitening effects. The manuscript is well drafted but there are some issues that I would like to raise:

- Many plants tested in the present study (Senna alata, Annona squamosa, Garcinia mangostana, Ardisia elliptica...) have been already screened for their antioxidant properties. Thus, this objective seems to be not very important.

- Also, one of the objective was to test the anti-wrinkle effects of the selected plant extracts. In my opinion, I think this objective has been partially completed since 4 plants out of the 14 used in the study have been screened for this purpose (see results on collagenase inhibition test).

- The authors should provide IC50 values which give a better representation of the potency of a drug.

- In the abstract section, results with Cassia alata are mentioned but this plant is missing on the list of plants tested the authors provided.

- Concerning the background section, I suggest the authors remove the paragraph starting from line 68 to 73 because it is a summary of the methodology, results and conclusion sections.

- The authors should provide results with reference drugs.
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