



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	2015_IRJPAC_16319
Title of the Manuscript:	Volatile constituents from the leaves of Pachira aquatica Aubl
Type of the Article	Original 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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	(i) *English should be improved, many mistakes (line 98, line 130, line 134, etc) (ii) *Many chemicals are listed in the introduction, they should be avoided and rewritten (iii) *The yield of essential oil should be determined (iv) *The number of analyzed samples should be extended, 300 g represent one individual? (v) *Perspective of the work should be mentioned in the conclusion (vi) *22 references is too much for a short communication of 2 pages	(i) Corrections were made where necessary (ii) These compounds were isolated by different authors. Removal of any kind may shortened the literature review on the plant. We have decided to maintain the status quo (iii) Yield included appropriately (iv) Information provided on what we have done (v) Included (vi) The reviewer may wish to point out the reference or information that we may need to exclude from the manuscript. We have provided comprehensive information about the plant and the research work we carried out. To our dismay another reviewer has recommended some other literature citation to be considered for inclusion into the manuscript.