



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_31407
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploring Gmelina arborea Leaves for biofuels and Petrochemical and Pharmaceutical Feedstocks
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	The examination of the article revealed some shortcomings. The introduction of the article was devoted to description of growing condition of Gmelina arborea trees and its use as source of biological active substances for medicine. Unfortunately, literature data about chemical constituents of leaves of this trees, as well as different methods for their extraction and study are not mentioned. Only two references [6, 7] were devoted to use of 3% sulphuric acid for extraction of acacia ear leaf, and no of leaves of Gmelina arborea. Regarding Materials and Methods: mortar and pestle, 1000 ml conical flask, 1000 ml beaker, filter paper, separating funnel, burette, thermometer, hot plate-magnetic stirrer etc. are not materials, but lab equipment. Regarding the experimental section – the choice of solvent for extraction must be justified, because it is unclear why the authors chosen 3% sulphuric acid for extraction and did not use a stronger 3% hydrochloric acid. Why only 3% instead of another concentration? Why water or alkali was not used for extraction? Additional remark: The title of the article does not match to content. The article does not contain info about biofuels or petrochemicals. Therefore it is recommend to change the title, for example: “Exploring of Gmelina arborea leaves as source of	Every work has scope. The scope of this study is to determine the chemical constituents of Gmelina arborea leaves and their applications using acid hydrolysis not to compare extract products from different concentration of an acid or different acids. That could be another study. Also we are not studying the life and growth of the tree. No literature data on the chemical constituents of Gmelina arborea leaves was found. Under materials and method, the issues there are addressed. As for the choice of solvent a lot of works have been done by the authors with different solvents; acid and non-acids but sulphuric acid has better performance. We are going to have another article comparing the performance of some solvents and methods used for extraction of leaves and constituents of leaves of different trees. Issue of biofuels is answered check line 141 down.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	biochemicals” or “Study of main constituents of Gmelina arborea leaves extracted with dilute acid”. The article contains some misprints, which should be corrected: e.g. “to <u>thre</u>at gonorrhea” (line 24); need to <u>tre</u>at gonorrhea. Due to above mentioned drawbacks, this article needs a lot of revision as follows: The title of the article must be changed. The introduction of the article should be expanded with use the references about various methods for extraction of constituents of Gmelina arborea leaves, and their study. <u>In Materials and Methods</u> – move the lab equipment from Materials to Equipment. <u>Regarding the experimental section</u> – the choice of 3% H₂SO₄ as solvent for extraction must be justified. It is better to perform the extraction with several solvents, e.g. with boiling water, 3% H₂SO₄, 3% HCl, 1% NaOH etc. in order to compare the content of isolated constituents using different extraction methods.	The misprints are resolved. All other issues are adequately addressed.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		