



## SDI Review Form 1.6

### **PART 1:**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">European Journal of Medicinal Plants</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>MS: 2012/EJMP/1987</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Antioxidative Action of Citrus limonum Essential Oil In Vitro and In Vivo on Humane Skin.</b>

**General guideline: Reviewers are requested to follow these guidelines during review: (Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper / case reports)**

- Introduction (*Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?*)
- Materials & methods (*Kindly comment on the suitability of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods should be provided to allow peers to evaluate and/or replicate the work*)
- Results & discussion (*Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?*)
- Conclusion (*Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only*)
- Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?
- This form has total 10 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**PART 2: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part and write here 'Corrected' if not agreed, give suitable justifications)
<b><u>COMPULSORY REVISION</u></b> comments	<p>The theme proposed by the authors corresponds to the question originality, because despite extensive studies on the species involved, the approach suggests a methodology pioneered applicability in humans.</p> <p>The article had revised his goal contemplated by the methodology and results, however it is necessary to better cohesion of information exposed to the data shown.</p> <p>Revise better visualization of graphical components of Fig.2, exposing more explanatory a legend. Advise putting the methodology of the summary number of sample used and the results express values with confidence intervals.</p> <p>Expose results concerning of methodology described in lines 136-137. The graphs displayed in the results show no further statistical correlation between samples.</p> <p>Suggest to increase the number of individuals in the sample used since the earliest studies to be conducted in humans usually have a 20 to 80 healthy volunteers</p>	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>There unnecessary introduction at the beginning of item 3 (Results and Discussion). Suggest displacement that paragraph.</p> <p>I suggest adding the title and summary (results) references to the compounds identified in the oil, giving importance to that characterization was performed.</p> <p>Review of chart component located on the first line of the abstract results.</p> <p>Importantly, the use of source update improves the quality of the article. More than 50% of the references are for more than ten years. Suggest updating the references referencing and matching of lines 283, 320, 322, 331 and</p>	



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	337, the magazine's standards.	
<b>Optional</b> comments	<p>Suggest that to further enhance the article be added bibliographies that can relate to the allocation of antioxidant effect major component identified in the chemical composition of the oil.</p> <p>Advise also that in Fig.2 show after the text relating of the figure, following exposure of the structure of the previous figure.</p>	

**Note: Anonymous Reviewer**