



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	2013_IRJPAC_5831
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Saponin Content of Extracts of Six <i>Citrus</i> Species in relation to their Medicinal Potentials.
Type of the Article	Research 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why the roots, stems, stem barks and peels were sun dried, though these may lost secondary metabolites 2. What the meaning of deeply present saponins in qualitative analysis, as this term has no connection with quantity 3. Add the name of the author before reference in line 63. 	<p>1. It was to make sure that there would be no growth of fungi which might lead to the decay of these parts. Secondly, Some researchers do oven dry, hence, sun drying was thought to be right because the moisture present in the plants would dry faster by this process.</p> <p>2. We suggest that it would be better to remove that since it makes no meaning.</p> <p>3. Ok.</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		