



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 'prevention'</p> <p>h, i, j and k - should read '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>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>m second word - should read 'need'. m, n and o - should be recast to reflect an unambiguous conclusion.</p> <p>Line 12, 13 and 14 - where is the reference for this statement?</p> <p>Line 66 - should read 'bye'. Line 101 - should read involved. Line 106 - should read 'experimental'. Line 119 - should read 'but'. Line 123 6th word - should read 'effect' Line 123 10th word - should read 'as regards the'. Line 133 4th word - should read 'used'. Line 133 12th word - should read 'on'.</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</p>	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>and 290 therefore, 1). CHECK line 6 Abstract g, h, 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.	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer