SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**American Chemical Science Journal**
Manuscript Number:	**2015_ACSj_18351**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Phytochemical Study, Microbiological Activity and Cytotoxicity of Leaves and Stem from Plant Species Mikania lindleyana DC.**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

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	**It is very difficult to make any conclusion on this paper because of the way it is written. I urge the authors to get the paper revised by a native English speaking person. The abstract of the paper is very unprofessionally written, it does not give any idea of whatsoever is on the paper (manuscript). The introduction has all the information but the language is very bad and such it is difficult to follow or gather the information. The definition of both primary and secondary metabolism can be better in this instance. I would like to at least see the HPLC profile of their extract, it will be nice if they can provide LC-MS if they have the infrastructure. I am worried by the lack of anti-microbial activities; maybe the extraction was so poorer that they didn't get any metabolites to exhibit anti-microbial.**	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Anonymous**
Department, University & Country	***University of Johannesburg, South Africa***