



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	2014_AIR_9452
Title of the Manuscript:	MEDICINAL POTENTIAL OF ACALYPHA WILKESIANA LEAVES
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	This article describes a simple chemical analysis of <i>Acalypha wilkesiana</i> leaves. The analysis is for basic chemical groups (alkaloids, flavenoids, terpenoids, etc.). The data would be much more useful if specific compounds within the groups were detected and presented (e.g. concentrations of caffeine, nicotine, theobromine, etc. - instead of total alkaloids). The Discussion is more of a literature review of the biological activities of the chemical groups rather than a discussion of the results of the present study. It should be shortened to make it more concise and directly applicable. It should be confined to the results presented in the paper. For example, how does the chemical composition of <i>A. wilkesiana</i> compare to that of other plant species? Have previous studies of the chemical composition of <i>A. wilkesiana</i> been done by other researchers? How did their results compare to the current study? Much of the information given in the Discussion also needs to be more completely referenced to show where it was obtained. The manuscript claims <i>A. wilkesiana</i> has potential for use in development of new drugs or industrial products based on the concentrations of compound groups reported in the paper. Unfortunately, no information is given to show how the chemical	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	composition A. wilkesiana compares to other plants. Is A. wilkesiana really any better than a myriad of other plants? Do the authors mean Cr₂O₄ (p. 5, line101) - or instead CaC₂O₄?	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Some of the information in the Discussion appears to be taken word-for-word from the Wikipedia website (e.g. lines 326-329). Although references are given, the wording is exactly the same as in Wikipedia.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rod Heisey
Department, University & Country	Department of Biology, Pennsylvania State University, USA