



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_39721
Title of the Manuscript:	ISOLATION AND CHARACTERISATION OF AN α -AMYRIN ACETATE ISOLATED FROM THE LEAVES OF MICROTRICHIA PEROTITII DC (ASTERACEAE)
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>)

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 study is very interesting and seems innovative, since there is very little information about this species in the literature. However, I see two serious problems: 1) Title, objective and text are not cohesive. What you did was isolate a compound for the first time in that species (this information must be given to the title). Also, when you describe that your goal is to isolate active principles, it seems to me that you would do biological tests to prove this. But you did not, what was done was a characterization and isolation of a substance that has therapeutic POTENTIAL according to the literature. Thus, it appears that your goal should be more restrict: for example: isolate compounds and analyse by literature review its potential to act therapeutically. 2) I was lost in regard to the flow of the tests you did. For me it did not make sense for you to run a whole fractionation and do the chromatographic analysis for only a fraction. It has a lack of information making it clear why this fraction was chosen for the chromatographic analysis. Ideally, you should have done a biomonitoring fractionation (by anti-inflammatory or antioxidant activity, maybe). It would make your article 500 times richer. However, since this was not done, I find it essential to have more detailed "fractionation versus chromatographic analysis".	1. I refer to line 124 as to the reason why fraction c was selected. Thus the biological activity was noted. 2. What we did was activity guided isolation and subsequent characterization of the active compound (s) from the herb.
Minor REVISION comments	Line 13 – I think that it would sound better to rephrase it to "active principles in the herb ONCE previous phytochemical".	
Optional/General comments		