SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Pharmaceutical Research**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_BJPR_30974**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Insights on the Infrared Spectrum, Phytochemical and antibacterial activities of Calotropis procera Leaf extracts against vancomycin and methicllin resistant bacterial isolates**
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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**The authors present an interesting paper with interesting and important data. However, there are some concerns that need to be clarify (see comments below).**	Ok.
Minor REVISION comments	Lines 100-101: describe the type of infections in which the *C. procera* is used. Line 149: Why didn´t you used modern techniques like HPLC-DAD or HPLC-DAD-UV-MS/MS? Please clarify this? Line 153: Is not normal using Tween 20. The normal procedure is using solvents like aqueous DMSO (Dimethyl sulfoxide) at different rates. Why did you used the Twee 20. Lines 171-190: Again, why did you used and old technique like TLC when it is a broad available more updated techniques like liquid chromatography? Lines308-349: Since you detected 5 types of compounds in the extracts (Table 4) of *C. procera*, do you have any idea about what was the type of	Corrected as appropriate. According to literature of Leonard *et al. (*2013). The method was used. Also that is the easily technique made available to used for me. According to literatures of Onifade *et al.* (2009) and Ogundare and Onifade (2009). Tween 20, DMSO and Distill water can be used as reconstituting agent. Tween 20 was used at the antibacterial of the crude leaf extracts while DMSO was used at the antibacterial of the column fraction of the leaf extract. According to literatures of Atta *et al.* (2009) and Usha *et al.* (2010) the methods were used. Also, column chromatography is easily available to be used. After getting the fractions they were spotted on precoated TLC plate to the get Rf. No grants were provided for this research. I had to make used of what I have within my reach. These constituents are bioactive compounds produced by plant. Each compound has its

	compound responsible for the observed bioactivity? Please comment this with justification.	pharmalogical importance. It is importance to know that the presence of the compounds give the plant its inhibitory effect against the isolated bacteria and its preliminary treatment of wound infections. Literatures of Amit *et al*. (2012), Rohit *et al.* (2012), Rajesh *et al.* (2014) and Lenta *et al.* (2007) justified this response.
Optional/General comments		