



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	2013_EJMP_7764
Title of the Manuscript:	The Story of Beta-sitosterol - A review
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Since this is a Review, there is a need for the Author to really substantiate the claim that β-sitosterol's antimicrobial activity is in doubt with the aid of more literature review.</p> <p>Highlighted word, phrase or statement(s) in the manuscript should be corrected as stated below.</p> <p>Line Number 6 Abstract</p> <p>g , - should read</p> <p>'prevention'</p> <p>h, i, j and k - should read</p> <p>'Furthermore, diverse biological activities whereby natural compounds or the extracts were considered while antimicrobial, trypanocidal, mosquito larvicidal even neutralization of viper and cobra venom characteristics were recorded.</p>	<p>All the corrections were highlighted in the text and also all of them were mentioned here.</p> <p>As could be seen in the literatures cited in the text some of them reported beta-sitosterol as an antimicrobial compounds but others reported that it is not active against examined microbes. Therefore, antimicrobial activity of the compound is in doubt so we decided to eliminate antimicrobial activity from its certain biological activities. Due to addition of some requested field in the text the line number differed in comparison to the previous version of manuscript.</p> <p>Line 6 abstract, g: preventing was replaced with prevention.</p> <p>h, i, j and k were replaced with proposed sentence.</p> <p>m: needed was replaced with need.</p> <p>References have been added for Line 12, 13 and 14.</p> <p>Line 66: "by products" is a correct form not "bye products".</p> <p>Line 101: involving was replaced with</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>m second word - should read 'need'.</p> <p>m, n and o - should be recast to reflect an unambiguous conclusion.</p> <p>Line 12, 13 and 14 for this statement? - where is the reference</p> <p>Line 66 - should read 'bye'.</p> <p>Line 101 - should read involved.</p> <p>Line 106 - should read 'experimental'.</p> <p>Line 119 - should read 'but'.</p> <p>Line 123 6th word - should read 'effect'</p> <p>Line 123 10th word - should read 'as regards the'.</p> <p>Line 133 4th word - should read 'used'.</p> <p>Line 133 12th word - should read 'on'.</p>	<p>involved.</p> <p>Line 106: experimentally was replaced with experimental.</p> <p>Line 119: but was added to the sentence.</p> <p>Line 123 6th word: affection was replaced with effect.</p> <p>Line 123 10th word: regarding was replaced with as regard to.</p> <p>Line 133 4th word: using was replaced with used.</p> <p>Line 133 12th word: in was replaced with on.</p> <p>Line 135: et al., was replaced instead of and co-authors.</p> <p>Line 149: The above "mentioned researchers" was replaced with 'Villasenor et al., (2002)'.</p> <p>Line 185: "the" was replaced before evolution.</p> <p>Lines 194, 217, and 269: β was replaced instead of B.</p> <p>Line 315: existed was replaced with found.</p> <p>Lines 318 and 321: 8. Phytosterol containing herbal medicines and drugs and table 2 was missed in this manuscript so we have added it in the reviewed version.</p> <p>Line 321, table 3: references 93-95 were arranged in a same line. The same correction was done on references 99 and 100.</p>
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Line 135 - should read 'et al.,'.</p> <p>Line 149 - should read 'Villasenor et al., (2002)'.</p> <p>Line 185 - should read 'the'</p> <p>Line 194 - should read 'β'.</p> <p>Line 205 (Table 1.) - should be represented in such a way that creates Sources of glucosides and esters separately.</p> <p>Line 217 - should read 'β'.</p> <p>Line 269 - should read 'β'.</p> <p>Line 288-290 - refer to line 328 and 329.</p> <p>Line 315 - should read 'be found'.</p> <p>Line 319 - should read '2'.</p> <p>Line 321 - should read '2'.</p> <p>Line 321 ref. 93-95 - these references should be on at the same line.</p> <p>Line 321 ref. 99 and 100- these references should be on at the same line.</p> <p>Line 328-329 - refer to line 288, 289 and 290 therefore, 1). CHECK line 6 Abstract g, h,</p>	<p>Line 333: prostate dictation was corrected. Also its dictation was checked in the whole text.</p> <p>The source of the phytosterols was added to the table as well.</p>
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>i, j and k and 2). recast statement not to infer positivity in antimicrobial activities of β-sitosterol. 3). This is conflicting with the idea of the author as stated in the texts and thus will be misleading to knowledge if not properly addressed.</p> <p>Line 332 - should read 'prostate'.</p> <p>Line 537-569 - should read 'prostate'.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Noticeable and confusing ideas sited in the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments	The conflicting statements with the texts of the manuscripts discovered in the conclusion should be decisively addressed.	