

Compulsoryrevision

Dear authors, the study presents great relevance and an excellent methodology, with innovative application in humans. However, some adjustments are still needed in the manuscript for publication.

Minorrevision

Most of the standards established by the magazine were met, however, there are some points to be corrected, such as, the prior presentation of a nonstandard abbreviation; absence from the place of collection of plant material, as well as number of exsiccate; absence of the number of process of the ethics committee; absence of statistical analysis; obsolete references.

1. Manuscriptstructure

The structure of the manuscript is required according to the rules of the magazine.

2. Title Page

The title includes all requirements.

3. Abstract

The abstract has less than 300 words, agreeing with the recommendations, but does not present the study design, location and duration of the study, as well as statistical data and sample size, contrary to the stated below:

Aims: Here clearly write the aims of this study.

Study design: Mention the design of the study here.

Place and Duration of Study: Sample: Department of Medicine (Medical Unit IV) and Department of Radiology, Services Institute of Medical Sciences (SIMS), Services Hospital Lahore, between June 2009 and July 2010.

Methodology: Please write main points of the research methodology applied.

Results: Kindly make sure to include relevant statistics here, such as sample sizes, response rates, P-values or Confidence Intervals. Do not just say "there were differences between the groups".

Conclusion: Non-invasive independent predictors for screening esophageal varices may decrease medical as well as financial burden, hence improving the management of cirrhotic patients. These predictors, however, need further work to validate reliability.

4. Keywords

The key words are immediately after the abstract, as requested, however, presents nonstandard abbreviation: GC-MS.

5. Abbreviations

Non-standard abbreviations should be listed and full form of each abbreviation should be given in parentheses at first use in the text.

The authors did not obey the demands regarding abbreviations.

6. Introduction

The introduction is well grounded. It presents the problem and justification so direct and objective.

7. Material and methods

The author does not mention the collection site and the complete identification of the plant material.

8. Results and Discussion

It was not given or was not cite any statistical analysis of the results obtained, which casts doubt on the significance and / or veracity of the results. A discussion of them was very limited (only two paragraphs). Lack of results regarding methodology of chemiluminescence.

9. Tables and Figures

Figure legends were not well prepared. Have little information.

10. Conclusions

This should briefly state the major findings of the study.

The author did not simply show the main conclusions. It suggested a protocol type.

11. References

References contained in manuscript are in agreement with the requirements, however no citations in 2012, furthermore, some are outdated.

12. Recommendation

Thus, we reported that this manuscript will be accepted. However, it requires a greater revision by the author, in order to remedy faults contained. It is suggested that be done, primarily, further discussion and more grounded in the

literature, in addition to statistical analysis it is essential to give credibility to the results.

Note: Anonymous Reviewer