



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	2014_IRJPAC_15653
Title of the Manuscript:	Chemical Isolation and Characterization of a Popular Detoxifying Herbal Remedy (YYB) Marketed in Nigeria using GC-MS and NMR Analysis
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 abstract should be rephrased using the acronym W-what was done, H- how it was done and O-observation. The background should go to introduction. Remove the word method, let the sentence flow. The IUPAC method of nomenclature was not followed in naming most of the compounds that were obtained. The authors used the NIST database in naming the compounds for example, 370; 1-Fluorododecane is the IUPAC nomenclature not Dodecane-1 Fluro; even at that, the name was spelt wrongly. Still on line 370, there is no nitrogen in the structure of DI-N-butylphthalate. Figure 4, the mass spectra of one of the compounds cannot be assumed to be a match for the data in the NIST Library; they could have been different compounds having the identical peaks.	We followed the format of -what is known (background) , what is not know (knowledge gap identified), how we did the work (methodology), what we obtained (results)and our inference (conclusion). We believe that this is good enough to give a summary of the entire work. The suggested editing has been made and the abstract can flow now. We have included the IUPAC names for chemicals named as such. The spelling of the chemical has been corrected. Though named as DBP, unfortunately NO nitrogen atom is identified . This is confirmed by a check on Wikipedia and other internet sources. We have named the specific compound that had the identified spectrum in Fig4.
Minor REVISION comments	Give a space between 90 and 91. The residue should be quantified, line 97. Line 102, give a space between 15 and gm. 15 gm is too much a quantity for a column of 3.5 x 60 cm. 109, what is the weight or quantity of each fraction(1,2 and 3).114 GC/MS, if the method is a common one, there is no point repeating it, the same goes	The space has been created. We have added the respective volumes obtained for each fraction. The methodology section has been modified. Some basic points were left to give neophytes that would read the journal when finally published some basic information required for GCMS/NMR analysis.. All other suggested points



SDI Review Form 1.6

	for ¹ HNMR analysis. 131, ¹ HNMR not as written. 154, 190, 268 should be The IR not NMR include the unit of measurement. 171, alkylated not as written. Line 188 coloured eluant. 304, triterpenoid- one word. There were inconsistencies in the referencing. Ref. 1 line 387, no pagination. Ref 7 line 410 has vol.2:1-5 while ref.9, line 419 has no vol. Included.	have been effected and entire reference reversed to meet journal requirement.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Line 281, Benzene to the best of my knowledge does not have sweet odour. The authors should go through the manuscript and do a thorough job of proof reading and be consistent.	We have added a reference to support our statement