



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_43547
Title of the Manuscript:	MALDI MS study of complexed alkaloid from <i>Colchicum</i> species
Type of the Article	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	- Lines 75-76, the complex has been previously studied by a number of other widely accepted spectral techniques. The Author(s) have not demonstrated the need for MALDI-MS study yet results are present for other widely accepted spectral methods such as NMR and others. They therefore need to justify the need for MALDI-MS study. - The abstract must follow the abstract writing format. To me it is still much lacking. It should summarise the aim, the method, the need to use this approach and results and perhaps recommendations. The originality of the article must be demonstrated. - The author(s) need to reference their work for the information which is not part of their research in this article. - Lines 23-25 look like plagiarism. Look at the article for reference [12] page 2. You need to rephrase it if you are to retain it. You have duplicated a lot from this article, which makes this particular article under peer review lose its originality. - Lines 23-25 still you're saying 'Not much research has been made on the formation of complexes between colchicines and cations'; to what extent? This is when the justification for the study would come in. I see that you have done work previously on this complex with cations, check lines 26-29. - Line 29 you say 'Solvents used for the synthesis were purified by standard methods' which methods are these ones. You did not give the references, reference [12] comes after a full stop and in any case your reference 12 is not about standard methods and again this statement is from reference [12], see page 2 of this referenced article.	- This is the first time when colchicine complexes were analysed by MALDI MS method. The need for MALDI MS study was added to article text. - Abstract was changed to the writing format, - Proper reference was added - Line 23-25 was changed. It was unintentional - Yes, some colchicine complexes were obtained by us, but before this time they were no under interest. - Purification solvents by standard methods mean that were distilled and dries with respective compound. - Description of methodology of was changed



SDI Review Form 1.6

	7. The methodology has been plagiarized from article of reference 12 since no reference to the methodology was given to this effect. So I could not look more at your data in the results section.	
Minor REVISION comments	The data could be fine but the writing is so much wanting. Someone could tag this article 'a plagiarized one'. So a lot is required to refine this article so that the novelty and originality is guaranteed. More comments and suggestions are attached in the manuscript pdf.	
Optional/General comments	This article has not been well written, its originality was compromised especially when a lot of duplication was done from a particular article (ref. 12 of the manuscript) and if justification would be made for MALDI-MS, it would give interesting data in the area of phytochemistry and analytical techniques with the article retaining its originality. If this article is part of previous study, why not demonstrate that, through appropriate referencing while originality of the article remaining intact? The data itself however could be authentic.] A lot of duplication was done from a particular article (ref. 12 of the manuscript). To me this is not ethically correct. Cross check with this article. Kurek J, Barczyński P, Colchicine complexes with lithium, sodium and potassium salts, spectroscopic studies. Croat. Chem. Acta, 2016, 89, 3, 1-12.	Article is now in template version, changes suggested by Reviewer were made. This article is not part of previous study, in previous our articles were described colchicine complexes and colchicine complexes mainly by NMR, IR spectroscopic methods The aim of this study was to check fragmentation pathways of colchicine complexes with alkali metals: Li^+, Na^+, K^+ by MALDI MS mass spectra as much modern than EI MS or ESI MS. MALDI MS were used recently not in article [9] because we did not have access to this kind of methods in 2007. Mesurements part, looks the same as in previous article, but it is difficult to write some technical details in different way without changing the meaning. In reference [9] in 2007 colchicine complexes were reported but without MALDI, probably Reviewer wanted mention reference [14] I can not agree with Reviewer about that part of article ref [12] were copied here in this manuscript, because in this manuscript colchicine complexes are described by MALDI MS mass spectra In ref [12] complexes of colcicine is different form colchicine alkaloid (it is derivative of colchicine = 10-demetoxy-10-hydroxy-colchicne) were described.

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	