



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	2015_IRJPAC_17436
Title of the Manuscript:	Taraxastane and Lupane Triterpenoids from the Bark of <i>Manilkara zapota</i>
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 (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	Line 148: please declare the source (either commercial or gift) of the PC3 cell line. Line 150: How much was the final DMSO concentration in the well? Did the authors run a solvent control? Table 2: please specify if data are mean $\pm$SD or SEM. Moreover, please indicate the number of replicates from which the presented average data come. Lines 257-259: from a pharmacological point of view, I do not see a precise rationale for the statement "compounds in the plant may react by synergy effect". First of all "synergy" is a peculiar pharmacological term that should be supported by documented interaction studies through for instance isobolograms. <i>Synergy</i> occurs when a combination of agents provides greater effect than would be predicted by simply adding together the effects of the components (see for instance Keith et al., <i>Nature Reviews-Drug Discovery</i> 4: 1-8, 2005). It is not clear moreover, how the present results show that an antimicrobial activity (which by the way was demonstrated here as poor or even missing) can interfere with eucariotic cell growth.	See line 57. All other substances, if otherwise not specified, were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich (Germany). Sorry we did not run the solvent control. $\pm$S.E.M., 4 number of replicates Yes I agreed with you and these lines were removed
Minor REVISION comments	Some word spacing to correct: Line 138: strains, whereas	Corrected see in the text



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 142: radius. Nystatin Line 163: carbon signals Line 173: the acetyl methyl Line 194: composition was Line 196: 1750 cm⁻¹) and a carboxyl Line 207: (d 76.7), one Line 220: 19S. From Line 217: we also measured the CD spectrum, which revealed Line 244: an IC₅₀ value of 61.2 and 62.5 µg/ml, respectively, compared to	Corrected see in the text Corrected see in the text Corrected see in the text Corrected see in the text Corrected see in the text Corrected see in the text Corrected see in the text Corrected see in the text Corrected see in the text
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript is very well written and clear, showing the accurate physico-chemical characterization of new triterpenoid compounds from an extract of <i>Manilkara zapota</i> bark. Data here presented add further knowledge on pharmacology of a traditional medicinal plant.	