



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">European Journal of Medicinal Plants</a>
Manuscript Number:	2013_EJMP_6926
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Kaurenoic acid isolated from the root bark of <i>Annona senegalensis</i> induces cytotoxic and antiproliferative effects against PANC-1 and HeLa cells</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Research Paper</b>

**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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> ( <i>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</i> )
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>The findings in this manuscript are interesting. The article needs only minor changes:</b></p> <p>The objectives of the study are really convincing.</p> <p>Materials &amp; Methods: Details were sufficient on the experiments described.</p> <p>Results &amp; discussion: It is better to include additionally a standard group. Figure legends should be more explicative. Example, P-values or confidence intervals could to provide complementary information.</p> <p>Results were conclusive.</p> <p>References cited were adequate.</p>	<p>We appreciate the reviewer's comments and wish to state that the inclusion of the 293 T cells could have served the purpose as they are not typical cancer cells.</p>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>The present manuscript may be revised and considered for publication.</p>	