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Respected Dear

It is submitted that all the queries raised by the Editorial Office have been addressed in the revised version. The response of each query is given below

Regards
Editor’s Comments

Comment
1. We note that the current submission contains some textual overlap with other previously published works, in particular:

Response
It is submitted that we requested to office to provide the textual overlap report for our consideration. But unfortunately we did not receive any response. Keeping in view the comment, we have rephrased some sections of the manuscript. We hope that now it will in acceptable range. We presume that the overlap will be Methods section and that is due to following of same methodologies. Although we have revised this section; further rephrasing will make it difficult for the readers to follow the methodology. The manuscript was return to reduce the similarity index. It is submitted that we tried our best to reduce the similarity index. After all the practice the similarity index is 39% checked by turnitin.com. We observed that most of the similarity is linked with chemical names and methodology section where some specific sentences are used to describe the methodology. Such chemical names and sentences cannot be changed. Most important the introduction, results and discussion sections have minor similarity that is in acceptable range. This shows that the manuscript is written by our self not copied from any material. (turnitin file attached with supplementary material)

Hope that this will be acceptable to the Editorial Office

Comment
2. Currently, the statement in your “consent for publication” section of your declarations is incorrect. Consent for publication refers to consent for the publication of identifying images or other personal or clinical details of participants that compromise anonymity. Seeing as this is not applicable to your manuscript please state “Not Applicable” in this section.

Response
It is submitted that we did not use any animal model or human in this study that a consent or ethical approval is required. For the clarity we also followed the recent published manuscript in BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicines and found same statement in such type of manuscripts.

Comment
3. In the Funding section, please also describe the role of the funding body in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript.

Response
It is submitted that we received materials from the university where this work was performed. As it is not project was written, submitted and approved for funding. Therefore we have changed the statement “no funding was received for this research work”.