



SDI Review Form 1.6

of

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_43042
Title of the Manuscript:	Ochnaflavone, a Naturally Occuring Biflavonoid: Pharmacology and Prospects for Further Research
Type of the Article	Review Paper

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The authors should be careful about the referencing of papers. It should not be mixed to confuse the facts by combining the references. It should write the points clearly. The author should re-arrange the paragraphs under 3. Pharmacology section. It should be grouped the paragraphs according to the described titles: anti-inflammation, anticancer properly. Line 149-153 is general information. It should be in introduction section. Line 169-175 is about anti-proliferation of smooth muscle cell. Line 175-179 is about anti-inflammation property. Line 179-183, "Another mechanism....IC50=4.5µM[39]." should be moved before line 204 because it is about anticancer. The anticancer and antiproliferation activities should be followed after Line 203 because they are concerned about anticancer activity.	Agreed, references have been properly addressed. Agreed, paragraph 3 have been grouped accordingly. Line 149-153 is a biological activity concluding paragraph, thus, suitable in its current position. Lines 169-175, 175-179, 179-183 agreed
Minor REVISION comments	- Line 38, the original reference should be added [Suzart, L.R.; Daniel, J.F.S.; de Carvalho, M.G.; Kaplan, M.A.C. Biodiversidade flavonoídica e aspectos farmacológicos em espécies dos gêneros <i>ouratea</i> e <i>luxemburgia</i> (ochraceae). <i>Quim. Nova.</i>, 2007, 30(4), 984-987.] - The author should revise the reference no. 15 thoroughly. Line 72, 73, 74, 79, the facts are not seen in the reference no. 15. - Line 72, reference 16 should be deleted. Reference 16 does not say about <i>Luxemburgia nobilis</i>. It is about <i>Ochna integerrima</i>. - Line 76, the compound number should be 2. The compound 2 is missing. If so, the following compounds' numbers should be changed. - Line 77, Reference 22 does not say about <i>Loniceria japonica</i>. - Line 81, spelling error in name of compound 6. It should be 2", 3"-diidroochnaflavone. - Line 82, "and aerial parts of <i>Luxemburgia octandra</i> St. Hill." should be deleted because Reference 17 said only about <i>Luxemburgia nobilis</i>. - Line 84, the reference should be 16 instead of 24. - Line 85, was reported from leaves "of <i>O. integerrima</i> (Lour) Merr. [16]" and stem bark ...The quoted information should be added more. - Line 86, the reference should be 20 instead of 15. - Line 87, "<i>Luxemburgia nobilis</i> (Leaves) [16]" should be deleted. Reference 16 does not say about that species. Please check carefully. - Line 88, after <i>Ochna beddomei</i> Gamble, the reference should be 25 instead of 15. - Line 90, reference no. 15 should be deleted. - Line 92, "both <i>Ochna beddomei</i> Gamble. and" should be deleted. "[15]. From the leaves of the latter" should be deleted. - Line 127, 2013 should be stayed in bracket like (2013). - Line 155-156, some more references should be added to support the sentence. - Line 159, anti-tumour and anticancer are the same. It should use only one. - Line 180-181, 'DNA fragmentation induction' should be written in 'induction of DNA fragmentation'. - Line 183, 'inhibited' should be deleted to smooth the flow of the sentence. - Line 200, the reference should be 34 instead of 35. - Line 205-207, Reference 41 does not say about "7,7"-di-O-methyl-2,3,2",3"-tetrahydroochnaflavone" and "8.7 µg/mL". If there is any reference about it, please add it, otherwise, they should be deleted. - Line 239, please deleted extra word 'was'. - Line 245, long form of RT (reverse transcriptase) should be mentioned in the very 1st time. - Line 248, the unit should be µg/mL. - Line 249, the compound name is 'nevirapine', not 'vitexin'. Please see Reference	Agreed



SDI Review Form 1.6

	22, Page 688. 26) Line 259-260, in reference 45, not about 'amentoflavone'. Ginkgetin was applied topically. So, the word 'amentoflavone', the phrase 'intraperitoneal (i.p.) injection and not through oral administration' should be deleted. The correct topical route should be mentioned. 27) Line 261, '3-8" binaringenin' should be corrected to 'l3, l18-binaringenin'. 28) Line 263, the original paper should be referenced instead of reference 9. [Kim, H. K., Son, K. H., Chang, H. W., Kang, S. S., and Kim, H.P., Amentoflavone, a plant biflavone: a new potential anti-inflammatory agent. <i>Arch. Pharm. Res.</i>, 21, 406-410 (1998a)] 29) Line 277, '5.1 New Research Avenues' should be in separate section placed above Conclusion. Then, the Conclusion section will be in 6. OR they can be combined to Conclusion section. 30) Line 318. The reference number should be only one, '12'. Please delete '30.'	
Optional/General comments	It is a good review. However, the author should be careful about the consequences of the information in a good consolidation. The reference used should be matched exactly to the information given.	