



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_42134
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of synergistic effect of different compositions of liquid extract of Citrus limonium and its linkage with β -cyclodextrin for the one-pot multicomponent synthesis of pharmacological bioactive compounds with application of exploratory analysis
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>)

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 Researchers should check table 1 and other tables in the work, there seems to be no superscript on the results, did the researcher carried out statistical analysis on this result. If yes then that should be included. They should also indicate which values (columns or rows) on the table have significant difference and at what percentage ($p \geq 0.05$)	Corrections Done. It has been mentioned now in subheading 2.9. Statistical Analysis: "All values represented in table 1 are mean of three replicates ($n=3$) with standard deviation ranging from ± 0.7 to ± 1.8 ." However, values in table 1 cannot be presented as $\pm$ standard deviation as principal component analysis was performed on the entire data and the software used for PCA (The unscramble X 10.5) does not take SD values. To the best of our knowledge, PCA has been used for the first time on this kind of research. So, just for better understanding and future use of PCA, table 1 is presented same as it has been used for PCA analysis.
Minor REVISION comments	They should be consistent in their referencing style. The first (1) reference has a different referencing style for the second reference (2).	Corrections done. References have been rearranged.
Optional/General comments	The research work is rich and will add to the store of knowledge. I recommend that it should be published after the corrections have been made.	