



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJBcRR_11350
Title of the Manuscript:	GC-MS Analysis of Phytochemicals of Leaf and Stem of Marsilea quadrifolia
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	Where are the standards in your GC-MS experiment? How do you know these peaks are right compounds? The database can only give you some guidelines. You definitely need standards for your GC-MS.	We have referred many papers regarding GC-MS analysis for this study. Most of the study indicated that the name of phytocompounds according to the NIST library. They did not compare the peaks with standard compounds. In this study we have found 39 compounds in leaf and 29 compounds in stem. So, totally we have reported 68 compounds. So, there is no possible to use all these standard compounds for comparison of this results. And also we are not having enough fund for this work. So, we request the reviewer to consider the GC-MS chromatogram results as like it is. Thank you very much for your valuable suggestions.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		