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	**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	**Overall, the study is straightforward and the results are clear-cut. However, the presentation needs improvement. First, the authors need to explain how the antioxidant activity of the novel compound relates to the traditional medical uses of the plant. Second, they should explain why they focused on this compound in the plant extracts. Is it the major component of the ethanolic extract or was there some other reason?**	
Minor REVISION comments	**Switch paragraphs 2 and 3 in the Introduction. Present the results in Table 3 in terms of molarity rather than micrograms/ml.**	
Optional/General comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer