



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_48701
Title of the Manuscript:	Chemical Composition of Abrus precatorius seeds
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	Please go through the corrections provided in the manuscript and effect changes.	<p>Most of the issues raised have been addressed in the revised version of the manuscript:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> English name for <i>A. precatorius</i> has been included and it has clarified that 'Gunja' is the term in Hindi (lines 30-31) Family (Fabaceae) has been specified (line 32). A reference has been added after 'hair' (line 39). 'Haemagglutinating activity' refers to haemagglutination, i.e., a specific form of agglutination that involves red blood cells. We do not think that it needs to be defined (provided that other medicine-related terms referred in the introduction have not been explained either). Moreover, the intended audience of <i>Eur. J. Medicinal Plants</i> is expected to have a strong background on this matter to understand these technical vocabulary. WHO/FAO acronym has been defined, and the year (2011) has been indicated (lines 42-43). We have not expanded the introduction, provided that we have already pointed to several review papers (e.g., doi: 10.12980/APJTB.4.2014C1069), and the interested reader may find more information about <i>A. precatorius</i> in those works (line 45). The details on the equipment are provided in their respective sections, provided that section 2.1 only focuses on chemicals and reagents (line 53). Some missing information (e.g. location for Mettler Toledo) has been added. The DSC software has been clarified (Proteus v.7, line 76). Missing information (2500 rpm) in the oil extraction procedure has been included (line 78). The use of brown and white cowpea seeds as a reference for pXRF measurements has been reported in doi: 10.1002/xrs.2678. A new reference has been added, as requested by the Reviewer. Three references have been added to the text in section 3.2, as requested by the Reviewer. Since relevant data in sections 3.4, 3.5 and 3.6 is already presented in the text, adding tables (as suggested by the Reviewer) would imply that the information would be duplicated. Thus, no additional tables have been included. Conclusions have been re-written.
Minor REVISION comments	Much grammatical errors observed.	The manuscript has been thoroughly revised, and grammar mistakes have been corrected.
Optional/General comments	The study is interesting but researchers should attach results of each result at the appendix	



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	