SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**European Journal of Medicinal Plants**
Manuscript Number:	**2013_EJMP_6926**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Kaurenoic acid isolated from the root bark of Annona senegalensis induces cytotoxic and antiproliferative effects against PANC-1 and HeLa cells**
Type of the Article	**Research Paper**

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	This manuscript describes the cytotoxic and antiproliferative effects of Kaurenoic acid in vitro. But the conclusion and the title of the manuscript are based on over-interpretation of the data, and it needs better interpretation or explanation. The data of manuscript are preliminary and do not support the author`s conclusion, some additional experiments need to be added. Few comments are mentioned below. 1. Only MTT data was shown in MS, it is not enough to support cytotoxic or antiproliferative effects of KA, more experiments need to be done. Cytotoxicity and antiproliferation are two different effects, and need to be clarified. Experiments, such as, western blotting for caspase3 and PARP; sub-G1 phase detection; annexin V-PI double staining assay could be done. 2. The concentration of KA in cell experiment is too high. As shown in MTT data, the decrease of cell viability may because of necrosis by high dose treatment of KA, so positive control data is needed. 3. In Discussion Part, line 5, "However, the most potent cytotoxic effect on the 293-T cells showed the possible antitumor effect of A2 against cancer of the kidney." Please make clearly, 293-T cells is not cancer cells. It is Human Embryonic Kidney 293 cells, a specific cell line originally derived from human embryonic kidney cells grown in tissue culture, immortalized normal cells. KA has cytotoxic effect on normal cells, how can author say KA showed the possible antitumor effect of A2 against cancer of the kidney? Moreover, the IC50 values of KA against 293-T, Hela and PANC-1 were 0.42, 0.70, 0.88 M. The data showed that KA is more toxic on normal cells than cancer cells. But in Fig. 4 and 5, KA is more toxic on Hela and PANC-1. The data is not consistent. Please explain. 4. The introduction and discussion is not related to the conclusion or the data. 5. Kaurenoic aicid is not a new compound. Its spectroscopic data does not have to be presented in the results section.	The authors are very appreciative of these comments. 1. We have noted the valuable comments of this reviewer. We employed the MTT assay method based on the available materials at the point of this study and the method can go for both cytotoxicity and antiproliferative studies. However, we will employ other assays suggested by this reviewer in the further work on the compound. 2. The molar concentrations have been corrected with the 293T exhibiting the highest value, showing that KA evoked more toxic effects on the HeLa and PANC-1 cells. 3. The sentence has been revised with respect to the PANC-1 cells which KA actually exhibited the most potent cytotoxic effect on. 4. The authors prefer to allow the spectroscopic data of the compound in the manuscript for easier assessment.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		