



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	_ Journal of Applied Life Sciences International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JALSI_28200
Title of the Manuscript:	Isolation and Antimicrobial Activity of Bioactive Methylated Flavanone from Methanol Stem-Bark extract of Nauclea diderichii (Rubiaceae)
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	1- Fix abstrcst to abstract 2- line 9 = you guys say the substance is new, that is unprecedented in the literature. However, nothing in the article refers to it. This correct this information? 3- In abstract indicate potential against HIV, but found no justification indicating how biological tests can lead to this conclusion. Why say this in the abstract 4 -line 75 = Fm0R turned ND-01? 5 line 83 = correct MgHtz unit to MHz, and line 89 was used to correct for the microgram symbol μg; And if only the MestReNova used to confirm the structure and none or reference bibliographic literature data? 6-line = 121 Fm0R was 30.5 g, the chromatography column was performed with 2.5 g; where these came 850g? And in Table 1 methanol extract has 24.4g? Correct or make it clear that data. 7- Presenting UV spectra and IR 8- Whose (substance, split, extract, etc.) are described in this data UV, IR and ^1H NMR? 9. Where there was obtained NDK12? It is a fraction or pure substance? 10- line 137 = Insufficient data to propose a flavone structure. I suggest spectra present and discuss in more detail the data. 11- line 142 = Insufficient data to propose a flavone structure. I suggest spectra present and discuss in	Done. Most of the unsubstantiated sentences have been removed. All corrections indicated in text effected and even more topographical and grammatical errors have been corrected. But some corrections like addition of strain numbers to bacteria and fungi could not be included because the strain we used had no numbers and we could not arbitrarily give them any. The values for the MIC could not be included since the Petrich dishes have been discarded. Also not that MestReNova alone cannot be used and was not the only parameter used to confirm the structure, other literature values were used and only compared with that simulated by MestReNova.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	more detail the data. 12 - Line 148 = there is no absorption band at ^1H NMR, it is not the case, correct the text. 13- Line 151 = is the mass spectrum of ND-06, but is otherwise NMR sample? 14- line 152 = fix M/ Z to m/z (and in italics) 15- present mass spectra and/or fragmentation pattern for this suggested structure. 16- Present table with ^1H NMR and ^{13}C data offset values and compared to similar structures literature data, and not only based on the values MestReNova. 17- To present and discuss the observed data and two-dimensional NMR spectra. 18- The biological activity test was done with crude extracts, however the title of the work indicates that it was carried out with the substance. 19- Presenting IUPAC name for this structure of flavone proposal. 20- On completion of the work = nothing in the text indicates that the observed results may be related to the presence of isolated substance. 21 - It was only isolated this substance? As it was isolated? And the others are there? The other, if any, would influence the results of the biological activity test? 22- the title and abstract suggest an isolation work, identification and biological activity test. However, the best data are described in the biological test, leaving the desired in the isolation and identification. Leaving the impression that it was not you who made the identification of the substance and do not have the data or security to discuss these topics. Strongly suggest improving these points, especially if this substance is really unprecedented in the literature. For an article about	The compound was isolated from the plant extract but has not been used as a purified substance to test for its activity. The reason for the recommendations Even the title has been modified to suit the context of the work and most, if not all, ambiguous statements deleted to give clarity, fluency and rational to the work. We most thank the anonymous editors for their
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	isolation and identification a new substance deserves greater attention in the identification of this structure to affirm it. I suggest see more carefully this information. If the main focus of the work is the biological activity tests suggest leaving this clearer since the title, the abstract and in the course of work.	contributions to read and improve on the work.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		