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Author’s response to reviews:

Editor Comments:
Authors have satisfactorily answered most of the comment asked by the reviewers and the quality of the manuscript has been improved. However, Reviewer 1 still asked some clarifications, which must be properly justified. In addition, authors are suggested to replace figure 7 with a scientific figure with defined axis. Authors must represent a better scientific report on HPLC outcomes. 'As depicted in Figure 7, a comparison..... cinnamic acid and caffeic acid.' .... where are the chromatograms of standard compounds?

RESPOND:
1. The authors have justified all clarifications raised by Reviewer 1.
2. Figure 7 has been replaced with a scientific figure with defined axis as requested.
3. The authors have added the chromatograms of standard compounds as requested. Only the chromatogram of cinnamic acid was presented for comparison against PECN. The authors did not include a chromatogram of caffeic acid in figure 7 after error was detected during the data analysis. Information related to caffeic acid was also removed from the text.
Reviewer reports:
Swarnalata Joardar (Reviewer 1): Please include all comments for the authors in this box rather than uploading your report as an attachment. Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included in a text format.

RESPOND:
1. The authors apologized for any inconveniences. The ‘respond to comments’ report uploaded as attachment was actually from the first round evaluation. The authors thought that the reviewer did not received the report after resubmission, thus, decided to upload the report as attachment.