



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_13587
Title of the Manuscript:	Cytotoxic, antioxidant and antimicrobial activity of aqueous and alcoholic extracts of <i>Annona muricata</i> L. seed and pulp
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	Why did not use doses of extract between 25-100? Soxhlet extract did not solve in water, it was solved in DMSO?? According to different articles MTT assay is not correct, it must be add to DMEM, then remove and add DMSO?? Reference for your protocol The data of column 1 an2 of table 1 are not clear, describe about them	1) Why did not use doses of extract between 25-100? A: Preliminary tests showed that IC₅₀ values of evaluated extracts for the cell lines HeLa and PC3 were less than 25 ug / mL (0.0024 to 7.194 ug/mL); whereas, IC₅₀ values for the cell lines SKBr3 and MCF-7 were more than 20 ug/mL (20.50 to >100 ug/mL). Therefore, all concentrations used in this experiment were needed. 2) Soxhlet extract did not solve in water, it was solved in DMSO? According to different articles MTT assay is not correct, it must be add to DMEM, then remove and add DMSO?? Reference for your protocol A: The lyophilized extracts (LSS and LSP) were diluted in water and extracts obtained by maceration (MSS) and Soxhlet (SSS) were diluted in DMSO. This was corrected in the main text (lines 125-126 of the revised version). On line 130 of the revised version was added the phrase "the MTT was removed" to clarify that DMSO was not added directly on the MTT 3) The data of column 1 an2 of table 1 are not clear, describe about them



SDI Review Form 1.6

		A: The data in column 1 and 2 of table 1 indicates that the HeLa and PC3 cell lines were much more sensitive to extracts. While, the other tested cell lines MCF-7, SKBr3 and fibroblasts showed to be less sensitive. Therefore, the IC50 values reported in those columns indicate that the multiplication of cell lines HeLa and PC3 were strongly inhibited by the studied extracts.
Minor REVISION comments	Cells were seed no grown in 96-well 120 plates (5×10⁵ cells/well) The media for cell lines is similar, write only one time The legends of tables are not clear Discussion is weak	a) Cells were seed no grown in 96-well 120 plates (5×10⁵ cells/well) A: Counts should be expressed as cells by well (space or container for liquid). Each plate has 96-wells. Why 120 plates?? b) The media for cell lines is similar, write only one time A: This was corrected in lines 108-115 of the revised version c) The legends of tables are not clear A: Legends on Tables were modified for better understanding. d) Discussion is weak A: Discussion was modified and extended.
Optional/General comments	competing interest-: yes	

Comment [AH(1): 5000-10000 cells