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Reviewer's report:

Manuscript entitled "Development of aqueous-based multi-herbal combination using principal component analysis and its functional significance in HepG2 cells" described the antioxidant activity of five plants individually and its formulation which further antiproliferative activity was evaluated. The presentation of the manuscript is nice with well scientific aptitudes. Some changes need to be fixed.

Page 5 line 99: Author mentioned "The wee-authenticated and validated..". If thee plants were authenticated, from where they were authenticated. Please provide name and reference number.

Page 5 Line 113: Author mentioned " in calculated proportion....". Please explain in short the reasons behind the selection of these type of percentage.

Page 6 Line 119: As the identified metabolites by UPLC are phenolics (phenolic acids and flavonoids), author should perform total phenolic and falonoid contents.

Page 11 Line 229: Author mentioned here the "Limit of detection and quantification". Why author did mention only one parameter of UPLC validation? There are many parameters such as Accuracy, Specificity, Precision etc. Author should mention all the other method validation parameters with supporting data.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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