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Dear Editor

**BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicine**

Dear Sir,

Subject: - Refer to **Comprehensive assessment of phenolics and antioxidant potential of *Rumex hastatus* D. Don. roots**

Dear Sir,

Reference to above manuscript; enclosed please find a revised version for resubmission. All points were considered in detail. We would like to thank the reviewer team for their careful reading of the manuscript. Their comments improved the quality of the manuscript and we hope that it will now be considered suitable for publication in your esteemed Journal.

Thank you for your attention.

Dr. Rahmat Ali Khan
Assistant Professor
University of Science and Technology Bannu
Email: rahmatgul_81@yahoo.com
Cell: +00923145796104
Dear Reviewer

Reference to below manuscript; enclosed please find a revised version. All your points were considered in detail. I am thankful for careful reading of the manuscript. Your comments improve the quality of the manuscript and I hope that it will now be considered suitable for publication in this esteemed Journal. Thank you for your attention.

Dr. Rahmat Ali Khan
Assistant Professor
University of Science and Technology Bannu
Email: rahmatgul_81@yahoo.com
Cell: +00923145796104

Reviewer's report

Title: Comprehensive assessment of phenolics and antioxidant potential of Rumex hastatus D. Don. roots

Version: 4 Date: 21 July 2013

Reviewer: ESRA Eroglu EROGLU OZKAN

Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

Material and Methods:

1- The authors have to give information about preparation of the extracts in detail.

Ans: Revised
2- The authors have to give information about using chemicals? (obtained from where?)

Ans: Mentioned now.

3- The authors have to explain abbreviations? (for example BRR, ARR, MRR, CRR, ERR, HRR)

Ans: Revised and mentioned

4- The authors have to give information about HPLC conditions in detail? (for example column, flow rate, injection volume, mobil phase, gradient or isocratic ext.)

Ans: Added as mentioned

5- The authors have to explain modifications for HPLC method. If these modifications require validation of the method, validation parameters should be completed.

Ans: No such requirement

Results:

1- What is the peak resolution value for each peak? HPLC chromatograms showed that this HPLC method has not provided a good separation between the peaks. For this reason, this method is not suitable for the quantitative analysis of Rumex hastatus roots extracts.

Ans: Off Course, There are more advanced methods, but Dear OZKAN due to lack of facility in our new established University we cannot do this. Please kindly accept the same.
Dear Reviewer

Reference to below manuscript; enclosed please find a revised version. All your points were considered in detail. I am thankful for careful reading of the manuscript. Your comments improve the quality of the manuscript and I hope that it will now be considered suitable for publication in this esteemed Journal.

Thank you for your attention.

Dr. Rahmat Ali Khan
Assistant Professor
University of Science and Technology Bannu
Email: rahmatgul_81@yahoo.com
Cell: +00923145796104

Reviewer's report
Title: Comprehensive assessment of phenolics and antioxidant potential of Rumex hastatus D. Don. roots
Version: 4 Date: 17 July 2013
Reviewer: Norhaniza Aminudin

Reviewer's report:
I have gone through the manuscript and my comments are as follows:
1. The scope of the manuscript is clearly define and the title is appropriate; the methods chosen are suitable and had been successfully conducted by other researchers in the same field; the data obtained contributed knowledge on the role of this medicinal plant as an effective natural antioxidant; the discussion and conclusion are well balanced.
2. The manuscript is well written and the abstract conveys what the authors have found.
3. Minor amendments:
i) Results; In vitro antioxidant assays
   The order of DPPH radical scavenging activity and superoxide radical scavenging activity listed AFC as one of the fractions tested. What is AFC?? Is it the same as ARR?
   Ans: Yes Madam, It is ARR. Changed in manuscript

ii) Results; Phosphomolybdate assay
   The order of result listed ELR. What is ELR?
   Ans: Madam, It is ERR. Changed in manuscript
iii) Discussion; Paragraph 2
Thus, our results suggested that………………………………., as some of the fractions showed highest scavenging ability than that of synthetic compounds. What do you mean by synthetic compound in this sentence? I could not find any use of synthetic material in this work except for the standards used ie. ascorbic acid and rutin. If the authors are referring to these standards, please re-consider your suggestion as none of the data (based on table 3) support this statement. All EC50 values for the fractions were much higher than the standards.
Ans: Modified the sentence

iv) Discussion; Sentence 6
Minor typo-spelling error, Qur # Our??
Ans: Madam, Changed in manuscript

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests