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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Editor

We have made the corrections according to the suggestion of the reviewer.

Yours Sincerely

Dr Muhammad R Khan

Reviewer 2.

Re-Review of the manuscript “Findings on antioxidant activity and total phenolic and flavonoid contents of Torilis leptophylla” by Saeed, Khan and Shabbir.

I read the reviewed manuscript and was really impressed with the amount of work the authors put in the manuscript. They really did an excellent job in attending to queries raised some of which were discretionary. The manuscript reads well and the volume of work now covered is very impressive.

Literature use is superb and the paper is well researched. The paper is now in a very acceptable form for publication. The authors can incorporate just these few corrections and there is no need for me to see the manuscript again.

Few minor corrections.

Material and methods: change n=hexane, n-butanol to n-hexane and n-butanol respectively. Do this elsewhere in text. corrected

Results: page 2: and Table 1 page 30. The mean values reported do not justify the reported uncertainty.
Thus e.g 189 for DPPH radical for methanol extract does not justify the reported uncertainty 4.2. It should be 189±4. Please amend the rest of the table accordingly. For values like 9±0.3 may need to be 9.0±0.3. Thus in the result section on page 2: 41±1.4 should be changed to 41±1; 10±0.9 to 10±1; 8±0.9 to 8±1; 57±0.3 to 57.0±0.3; 68±1.8 to 68±2. The last two values are okay. corrected

Values are rounded both in the table and in the text

Background page 4 second paragraph: change “know” to “known. corrected

Page 5 Chemicals: since English “English” was used rather than American “English” and for consistency change “sulfo” in sulfosalicylic acid to “sulpho”. corrected

Page 6: Under DPPH radical scavenging assay the value 0.980±0.02, for reasons stated earlier should read 0.98±0.02, similarly for value 0.700±0.02 on page 8 ABTS radical scavenging activity should read 0.70±0.02. Last paragraph first sentence to 2, 2'- corrected

Page13: second paragraph change “sulfosalicylic” to “sulphosalicylic”. corrected

Page 14 change 41±1.4 to 41±1; 62±2.1 to 62±2; 55±0.3 to 55.0±0.3; 68±2.2 to 68±2;

Page 15: change 10.71±1.8 to 10.7±1.8; 135±3.6 to 135±4; 196±4.3 to 196±4; 8±0.9 to either 8.0±0.9 or 8±1; 27±1.2 to 27±1; 62±1.9 to 62±2 and 68.05±1.9 to 68.1±1.9, next page 9±0.3 to 9.0±0.3; 122±4.7 to 122±5; 130±4.8 to 130±5. Values are rounded

Page19: first paragraph line 5: cancel the second “of biological” deleted

Page 20 Second paragraph change “aqueous” to residual aqueous extract”. Page 20 third paragraph line 11 put fullstop (period after word “correlation and a comma (,) after word “However” corrected

Page21 second paragraph first sentence change “lot” to “a lot of” Next sentence insert word “that” between “chemicals” and “have” corrected

References:

Ref 2: Fullstop (period) after word “Wagenitz” and delete fullstop (period) after word “Rec” corrected

Ref 4, 28, 42: for consistency with other references- remove issue number. deleted
Ref22: change “inflammation” to “inflammation” corrected
Ref26: for consistency remove fullstop (period) Between “J” and “Ethanopharmacol” corrected
Ref 46: change “J Chromatography A” to “J Chromatogr A” corrected
Ref 51: For consistency remove fullstop (period) after “J” and “Agric” corrected
Ref 51: remove comma (,) after the word “spinos” corrected
Ref 60: lower caps for “A” and “P” in aerial parts. corrected

Conclusion: This is a very nice manuscript and I recommend publication after these minor corrections.
There won’t be any need for me to look at the manuscript again.
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