



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 BRACHYSTEGLIA EURYCOMA HARMS
Type of the Article	original

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	Introduction: The authors have not mentioned any chemical constituents previously isolated from this plant. Moreover, the isolated compound is new for the plant or already reported by others should mention. Extraction of Plant Materials: Difficult to understand for the readers. Here they should mention only the extraction process. Compound elution was performed by column chromatography with different solvents of different polarity with ratio.....etc. Please re-write clearly. Determination of Antioxidant Activity: It should completely re-write. There is repetition of the same sentence between blank line 90 and for compound line 88. Line 98, experiment should be repeated three times with each concentration. I am very much confused because in statistical analysis section they have mentioned :All measurements were replicated three times and standard deviation determined Statistical analysis: there is nothing mention which software was used for the analysis of the data Results and Discussions: figure of Proton NMR spectral data should be added. Line 171 Table 3: Free radical scavenging activities of compound 1: they have performed lipid peroxidation, but here have showed free radical scavenging????	Ok ok ok We meant that the experiment was repeated three times. Conventional formulae were used for the calculation. However, by the recommendation of another reviewer, it has been discarded. Lipid peroxidation is the process in which free radicals steal' electrons from the lipids



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Did they carry out DPPH, NO, H₂O₂ etc. scavenging activity? Moreover, data should be presented graphically Conclusion: Only lipid peroxidation activity could not prove <i>in vitro</i> antioxidant activity and difficult to conclude that can be used in free radical mediated diseases.	in cell membranes, resulting in cell damage. Based on the ability of the isolated compound to limit this, we reported its antioxidant activity. However, the title has been modified to anti-lipid peroxidation instead.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 80 : 1000 ml ethanol better to write 1L ethanol	ok
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Please clarify the ethical issue.	ok