



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJBcRR_13459
Title of the Manuscript:	GC-MS Analysis of Leaf, Fruits and Latex of Croton bonplandianum Bail
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	I've summarized the available data of GC/MS Analysis for Croton bonplandianum and I found 37 major compounds not only 21 as the author reported herein. I'd like a better elucidation about it, if possible!	In this study, we analysed the phytochemicals of ethanolic extract of leaf, fruits and latex separately by GC-MS. In the earlier study, the researchers found eleven phytochemicals in the chloroform leaf extract and sixteen phytochemicals in the ethanolic leaf extract of <i>C. bonplandianum</i>. But in this study we found only five compounds in the ethanolic leaf extract, among these only one compound phytol is commonly reported in both studies remaining four compounds are newly reported. We also newly reported fifteen compounds in the fruits extract and one compound in the latex extract. Now we discussed these points in the discussion section clearly.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 116: 200.000 or 2.000.000 Nothing to report,	I did not understand your query regarding the line 116. But the line 116 is in the correct format with appropriate message.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I recommend to re-elaborate the discussion paragraph before publishing the paper (in the interest of the author), do not overlap other publications.	Thank you very much for your valuable comments regarding the discussion part of this article. Now we added more relevant points in the discussion part and also modified the discussion section as per your instruction.