



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	2013_IRJPAC_8594
Title of the Manuscript:	ISOLATION, CHARACTERIZATION AND ANTIOXIDANT ACTIVITY OF 3-(5-HYDROXY-2-(4-HYDROXYPHENYL)-4-METHYL-CHROMEN-3-YL) PROPANOIC ACID FROM THE STEM BARK OF BRACHYSTEgia EURYCOMA HARMS
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: the paper is ok except that the authors did not subject the isolated compound to ¹³ CNMR which will indicate the number of carbon atoms present in the compound. Thus characterization is incomplete.	Dear Reviewer, ¹³ CNMR does not in all cases give the exact number of carbon atoms but it gives information on the type depending on the nature or chemical environment of each carbon atom. A glimpse of that information can be obtained from IR (most functional groups bear carbon atoms), ¹ HNMR (most protons are bonded to carbon which also affects the chemical shifts of those protons) and mass spec. (fragmentation pattern also helps).
Compulsory REVISION comments	The authors should publish only the Antioxidant activity and thus change the title of the paper to "Antioxidant activity of stem bark of <i>B. Eurycoma Harms</i> " for the work to be fit for publication or include the analysis of ¹³ CNMR to retain the title.	Our paper is Chemistry and not Anatomy, biochemistry or Pharmacy. The antioxidant activity is just a test of the bioactivity of the isolated compound.
Minor REVISION comments	The word mash (in number 67) is mesh.	Ok.
Optional/General comments		