



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCS_35033
Title of the Manuscript:	Phytochemical and antimicrobial studies of Maprounea membranacea Pax & K. Hoffm (Euphorbiaceae)
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	<p>Discussion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Line 129-136: It is not clear what the author wanted to put out. The study did not consider the structural transformation of bacterial cells. Hence there is no way the assertion that the sensitivity test did not show any variation in structure can be accepted. Sensitivity test: The concentration of the extract used was not stated. More also, it is difficult to get the exact trend of activity when different concentrations have not been used. Line 152-154: It is not clear to see from both tables any significant difference in the results. The statement that the antibacterial and antifungal activity vary with the extract of the plant cannot be accepted on its face value unless a significance test is conducted which I encourage the author to consider. <p>Structural elucidation: It is mind-boggling and difficult to accept the proposed structures to have been isolated and identified from the plant when author failed miserably to provide evidential data to support this. Author must provide the spectral data and other physical or chemical determinations that could help identify and confirm such structures.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>Experimental</p> <p>a. The concentration (s) of extracts used for the sensitivity test not stated.</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>a. Line 155-160: This was an attempt to compare the result with that found in literature. However, author failed to link the two properly. This must be properly done to avoid any ambiguity.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>a. Line 178: Phytochemical study.....<u>gave</u> eight <u>known</u>.....</p> <p>b. Line 179: Crude extracts and <u>fractions</u>.....</p> <p>c. Did all the extracts give significant in vitro fungicidal activity against all the four fungi strains? I don't think so. See table 2 and amend.</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>Good intention and good attempt to contribute to knowledge in the field. However, the statement of problem was not clearly stated in the introduction and the results obtained especially on structure elucidation not thoroughly discussed to the best conviction of all.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Victor Y. A. Barku</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Chemistry, University of Cape Coast, Ghana</i>