



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_15724
Title of the Manuscript:	Validation of Structures of Novel Eudesmane Sesquiterpenes using Scatter Plots
Type of the Article	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	1. Results and discussion section is very short, the author must explain at least one more carbon position. 2. In plots some point/dots are overlapping and hard to explain regarding substituents, which must be expanded or blow up. 3. Substituents and their corresponding codes should be clearly write in table or otherwise. 4. Is the scatter plot is helpful in the identification of a new substituent at a specific carbon position, not mention in the columns. 5. At some C-atoms (e.g C2) in the skeleton the percent probability for more than two substituents are very close. How will you justify that scatter plot is still a best toll for validation of structures of novel Eudesmane Sesquiterpenes?	1. This correction has been effected (lines 152-160). 2. The plots have been expanded (blown up) as much as possible. 3. More than 200 codes were generated and used in the study. The authors are of the opinion that since the procedure used in generating the codes has been clearly stated (lines 44-48) it would not be necessary to insert all the substituents and their corresponding codes. 4. No. Lines 168-171 alluded to this. 5. A justification has been provided in lines 152-160.
Minor REVISION comments	- Line 28: (space between sesquiterpenes and [9]. - Line 42: (write (carbons) instead of (carbon). - Line 44: Each substituent codes. (What is mean by 3 number codes) - Line 48: Thereafter, 30.....an Excel sheet. (write 3 instead of 30) - Lines 127-128: Scatter plots.....of Asperjinone. (Insert proper name after 'by' and write reference '[10]' at the end of sentence) - Lines 129-131: The program.....oxirane fragment. (Rewrite it)	-Line 28: Correction effected. -Line 42: Correction effected. -Line 44: An explanation was given in text using OH as an example (lines 47-48) -Line 48: Authors are of the opinion that the figure should read 30 (and not 3) since there are 15 carbon positions and each position has a ¹³C chemical shift value and a corresponding code for substituents. -Lines 127-128: Correction effected -Lines 129-131: Correction effected



SDI Review Form 1.6

	- In the table, spacing format between substituent and % probability is not same.	-Correction effected
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The authors made the efforts to provide a better work.	