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| PART 1: Review Comments | | |
| Compulsory REVISION comments | Reviewer’s comment | Author’s Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | **This manuscript presents valuable research on the pharmacognostic standardization and chemical analysis of *Euphorbia nutans*. The scientific methods, particularly the use of GC-MS analysis and microscopic evaluations, are clearly outlined, although more detail is needed to improve reproducibility. Specifically, the choice of dichloromethane as the extraction solvent requires further justification. Additionally, the manuscript could benefit from clearer explanations regarding the importance of these results in relation to species identification and the practical applications of these findings.** | The concerns of the reviewer are addressed |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **Yes, the title is suitable, as it clearly reflects the content and focus of the manuscript.** | The authors appreciate this gesture |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | **The abstract is generally well-structured but could benefit from more detailed descriptions of the methods used, particularly the specifics of the microscopic analysis and GC-MS profiling. Adding this would make the abstract more informative for potential readers.** | We disagree with a well detailed methodology in the abstract section as they are captured in the methodology section. A little more data has been added to the result section most especially capturing the major phytochemicals identified by GC/MS |
| **Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** | **The subsections and overall structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The methodology and results are clearly presented, although the discussion could be expanded to offer more interpretation of the data.** | The discussion is has been expanded by introducing additional references [29- 32] |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | **This manuscript contributes to the body of knowledge surrounding the pharmacognostic standardization of medicinal plants, specifically *Euphorbia nutans*, which has ethnomedicinal significance. The study's detailed microscopic evaluation and chemical profiling using GC-MS provide a valuable reference for future pharmacological studies. However, the manuscript would benefit from a stronger discussion on the broader implications of these findings, especially regarding quality control in herbal medicine.** | This has been addressed and moreso, the GC/MS spectra of the dichloromethane fractions (figure 4 and 5) are inserted in the manuscript. |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.**  **-** | **Yes, the references are sufficient, although adding more recent references, especially in relation to GC-MS applications in plant analysis, would strengthen the manuscript.** | More references have been added |
| Minor REVISION commentsIs the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language is mostly suitable, but there are occasional grammatical errors and awkward phrasings that need to be revised for clarity and fluency. | The grammatical errors have been reduced as the manuscript has been proof read and paraphrased further |
| Optional/General comments | The manuscript provides a detailed chemical analysis of *Euphorbia nutans*, which has potential implications for its medicinal use. However, the discussion could explore more on how these findings align with existing literature and their practical applications. Additional interpretation of the GC-MS results and the role of identified compounds would enhance the manuscript's value. | The pharmacological applications of some of the identified major phytochemicals were captured. The authors think that this is adequate for the scope of this study. |
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|  | **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)* |
| **Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?** | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* | NIL |