



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">European Journal of Medicinal Plants</a>   |
| Manuscript Number:       | 2015_EJMP_16597  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>Synergistic antimicrobial and Antioxidant activity of crude saponins from Paronychia argentea and Spergularia marginata</b> |
| Type of the Article      | <b>Original Research Article</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**

|                                     | 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)  |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments | <p>1. Please add the references to the methodology section, to know which methodology you followed.</p> <p>2. Apart from TLC , how will you know that extract you extracted is only saponins. If saponins what type of saponins based on phytochemical screening.</p> <p>3. Please add the analytical data like IR, MASS spectroscopy details of the total extract.</p> <p>4. The methodology of extraction is not sufficient to isolate only saponins, along with saponins , other triterpenoidal moieties also will elute. Justify to say that it is only saponins.</p> <p>5. And which fraction you got saponins , whether butanol or pet ether , clearly please mention</p> <p>6. Atleast you have to add pyridine when your separating the saponins from aqueous portion.</p> <p>I had gone through the entire summary of this paper, infact its a good trail by authors but clarity in extraction and phytochemical analysis is missing and proving that research work in this paper is not focused in depth.</p> <p>However this paper can be accepted as a short communication. after add on phytochemical analysis.</p> | <p><b>1-For each method the reference is indicated</b></p> <p><b>2- The extracts obtained are rich of saponins but some other heterosides may be present. This is confirmed by the revelation on TLC with Godin reagent. The saponins appear in violet or blue color. In addition the foaming index confirms this statement.</b></p> <p><b>3- Triterpenoids are less polar compounds. The methodology used is for triterpenoid or steroid glycosides (extraction first with methanol-water) and extraction of the aqueous solution with a polar solvent (butanol). Finally the compounds are obtained after precipitation in ether.</b></p> <p><b>4-The crude saponins are obtained after precipitation in ether</b></p> |



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments   | 1. Season of collection and processing of material should be mentioned.   |  |
| <b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments | The researchers are strong in there invitro and invivo analysis but utterly they failed to say strongly that the extract is of only saponins.. if the process they followed is the same as they stated , along with saponins there will be many triterpenoidal moieties, atleast they have to characterise the total extract atleast by IR. And there is no use in seeing the synergy. As Antimicrobial screening itself saying they are significant antimicrobials.. so synergery will be present. |  |