



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJPAC_33353
Title of the Manuscript:	Detection of Phytotoxin Produced from Leaf, Neck and Finger Blast Disease Causing Magnaporthe grisea through GC-MS Analysis
Type of the 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	In the abstract, a) Delete the values of 3 Rf. These values are useless without TLC details. The compounds are not identified. b) Octadecane (CAS), Quinic acid, 1,2-Benzenedicarboxylic acid-bis-(2-ethylhexyl) ester (CAS), Holothurinogenin-2, α-Patchoulene (CAS), Synaptogenin B, Zingiberene (CAS) and 2H-Pyran-2-one, 6-hexyltetrahydro-δ-Hexylvalerolactone are mentioned. Authors should justify these choices. There are others in discussion. By the way, octadecane is not octadecene	Values of 3Rf were deleted, revised all the identified compounds evenly in abstract, results and tables. Changed octadecane
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Rf does not need to be defined. Are the TLC toxins proteins? Why the authors use Sephadex G-75? Is the HPLC column only 3 cm long? Line 146: Compounds were identified by absorbance at nm over 10 to 25 min (total analysis time 35 min). This is meaningless. The manuscript would be edited.	Basically, this toxin is a high molecular weight protein, so that we used Sephadex G-75 for partial purification Revised Edited
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The identification of the proposed phytotoxins in this paper is not totally demonstrated. The list of compounds listed in GC_MS is too large and speculative. There is no warranty that they are phytotoxins. Identification of some of them is also doubtful. There is no direct relationship between the TLC and GC_MS. There is not MS data. There are too many minor errors and ambiguities throughout the text. Reagents listed in M&M are not used in results, and opposite (i.e iodine tank). Rf values are relative values, and they are useless in the abstract. Manuscript should be simplified, and only well identified compounds with chance to be phytotoxins would be described in the discussion. Materials and Methods, Results and Discussion should be consistent. Conclusion is too general.	Yes agreed with this, It is only profiling of partially purified compounds.