



SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
<p>I have revised the reports of the reviewers and the revised manuscript. The authors have implemented in a great deal the suggestion of the reviewers but the manuscript lack of correct academic format and needs more clarity in some aspects.</p> <p>In this sense, the material and methods section is confusing regarding the different groups and their composition (number of animals).</p> <p>Results and Discussion must be must be presented in different sections.</p> <p>In agree with the reviewers, the referencing style in the body of the manuscript has not been completely corrected.</p> <p>In my opinion a new revision is required.</p>	<p>This issue has been attended to in section 2.8 (i.e the experimental design). Again, in respect to the acute toxicity studies (section 2.6), this has to conventionally be performed prior to allotting the experimental animals into respective groups and doses. The number used in this aspect is independent of the number of animals used/to be used in testing the efficacy of various doses. The significance of this test cannot be over-emphasised as it determine the safe dose margin to be employed.</p> <p>Unless if this is a rule/condition set by the publisher. Otherwise, for a test that involves determination of many parameters (as in the case of our paper) it is conventionally permissible to combine result and discussion together. This is with a view to do justice and justify any change(s) associated with a given parameter that may come up therein.</p> <p>The observation thus made is gratefully acknowledged and necessary corrections effected.</p> <p>Thank you .</p>