



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_26655
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of Bioactive Compounds in Latex of Croton bonplandianum (Baill.) using GC-MS
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:



SDI Review Form 1.6

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

ART 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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 88: Nowadays... Lines 93-94: the text is repeated in the item 2.2.3. LINE 149: Dibutyl phthalate is a regular contaminant present in different CG-MS procedure. Its presence in the discussion should be disregarded, as well as the table. LINE 112-113: give reference to Duke's database (website, i.e.). Line 160: The comment is deleterious, because the chemical components of essential oils or latex are not isolated.	Dear Reviewer, Thank you very much for your valuable comments regarding the manuscript. As per your comment in the line 88 we changed the word as Nowadays instead of Now a days. Now we deleted the repeated sentence in the lines 93-94 of the results and discussion section as in the item 2.2.3. Thank you for this suggestion. Now we deleted Dibutyl phthalate in the text of this manuscript including table and results and discussion section. As per your suggestion, we have given the reference (http://www.ars-grin.gov/duke/) for Duke' database in the line 112-113 and reference section. Thank you. Now the deleterious comment on 160 has changed with meaningful as per your suggestion.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		