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Author’s response to reviews:

Respond to Reviewer #1

1. The author has edited the reference style (pg 20-24) following the journal instruction and has mention the sources of drugs or chemical compounds in bracket for example (Aldrich or Sigma) after the name of the drugs or chemical compounds.

2. Table 1 is alldready a compilation of Fig 1, 2 & 3 in the original form. The author has exchanged Fig 1 and Fig 3 in the revised manuscript.

3. The author wish to defend the original form of Fig 3 (Cell viability of HCT 116) and Fig 4 (Cell viability of CCD-18co) after exposure of acetone extract from stem bark of C. odontophyllum instead of combining them in one graph to look crowded and messy.

4. The author have corrected all the typographical and grammatical errors throughout the manuscript.

Respond to Reviewer #2

Introduction

1. The author has included research works regarding anticancer activity [11] and other activity [9,10] in Background section

2. Information about pure compounds are not available but the author has mentioned the secondary metabolites of the stem bark from this plant [12].
3. The objectives of this study has been included in Introduction section as "to investigate the mechanism of cell death and to determine the genotoxic effect of extracts from the stem bark of C. odontophyllum against human colorectal cell line HCT 116" on page 4.

4. The author has deleted detail about apoptosis and necrosis in Introduction section as suggested by reviewer.

Materials and methods

1. The author has included reference for MTT assay [16] and alkaline comet assay [17] as suggested by reviewer.

2. The study did not involved any dilution of the plant extract so the authors do not think necessary to include preparation of dilution methodology in the revised manuscript.

Results

1. Table 2, Fig 10 and Fig 11 have been removed from the manuscript as they were not refereed to in the text. However, the authors have referred Fig 1 in the text in the revised manuscript.

Discussion

1. The author has explained in detail the term selectivity index (SI) in the original manuscript.

All the minor comments have been addressed and corrected as suggested by reviewer.