



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2015_IJBcRR_17241
Title of the Manuscript:	GC-MS Analysis of Bioactive Constituents of Ethanolic Extracts of Aerva lanata (Linn.)
Type of the Article	Original research paper

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) The title need modifications	As per your suggestion the title of the manuscript was modified as Gas Chromatography-Mass Spectrometry (GC-MS) analysis of ethanolic extracts of <i>Aerva lanata</i> (L.)
	(ii) Methodology requires revision especially on the Information on GC analytical step.	Thank you. As per your comment we revised the materials and methods section.
	(iii) The described method of identification of the constituents is not adequate	Phytochemicals were identified based on the NIST library. Already we have clearly explained about identification of phytochemicals in the text.
	(iv) Retention indices of each compound as along with retention time should be stated	Now, we included the retention indices of each compound in the text as per your comment.
	(v) IUPAC names of the phytoconstituents as against the trivial names is required	As per your suggestion, IUPAC name of identified phytoconstituents were included in the tables against the trivial names.
	(vi) The grammatical expressions need revision	Thank you. As per your comment, we found a few grammatical mistakes in the text. Now we corrected the grammatical error in the text



SDI Review Form 1.6

	(vii) The manuscript contained lot of irrelevant information which requires modification (viii) Results need validation (ix) Discussion are not adequate (x) The references need to be check for more correction (xi) All the areas requiring revision and modifications were already highlighted in the pdf. (xii) All red lines indicated in the pdf file are to be deleted	As per your comment, we deleted irrelevant information from the text and added more relevant information regarding this work. Dear reviewer as per your suggestion we modified the results section. Now, we added adequate information in the discussion section. Dear reviewer, thank you for your suggestion. As per your comment the references section was checked and modified according to the journal's format. As per your suggestions were highlighted in the pdf format we revised and modified the manuscript. Thank you. As per your comment all red lines indicated in the pdf file were deleted and modified the text. Dear Reviewer, thank you very much for your valuable comments for improving the manuscript
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		