

Editor's Comment:

I have carefully perused all the reviews of all the four reviewers. I have also critically evaluated the manuscript myself.

It is regretted that the manuscript has to be rejected as it does not comply with the standard requirements of a peer reviewed publication.

The major reasons are:

1. The materials and methods described is incomplete and very poorly organized.
2. The materials and methods section suffers from systematic presentation of the methods adopted.
3. The statistical methods employed are not at all presented. The means should be presented with their standard errors and describe which statistical tool was used to derive the CD. Pairwise comparison of mean scores should be properly addressed for all the parameters
4. Several things have been unnecessarily included such as equipment and instructions in the methodology section. All these instructions should be incorporated with in the description of procedure that was followed. There no need to separately describe it again in detail. All methods should be presented in past tense in the sequence as adopted by the authors during execution.
5. The language of the whole manuscript is extremely poor and not up to the standard of an international peer-reviewed journal. There are several grammatical and syntax errors. In addition, the facts have not been properly presented.
6. The title itself has been generalized. Since this is an original research manuscript, it should describe the specific work, i.e., the effect of use of different herbal extracts primarily optimizing their concentrations.
7. The prime objective of this work was to identify the best herbal extract to be used as an excellent coagulant. However, in the whole manuscript no discussion has been made as to which extract was better? No references of extracts or other materials that have been used in previous studies are properly cited to this effect, nor compared and discussed.
8. Each extract should have been provided with the details of how these extracts were prepared? What was the starting amount of each of these herbs used for preparing their extract. No mention has been given on this account whether it was prepared in lab or commercially obtained.
9. The graphs presented are not self-explanatory and do not conform to the scientific presentation of data.
10. The tables are not complete. When three extracts have been used at two different concentrations, then why the organoleptic analysis in the tables do not depict any values for A1, A2 and A3 in their B1/B2 and C1, C2 combinations?
11. All sections suffer from poor substantiation by references. Results, Discussion and Conclusions have been vaguely described. It should be very specific and self-explanatory justified with references.
12. Hence on the whole, the manuscript is below standard and cannot be accepted for publication in the present form.

I have also attached the revised manuscript with my all line-wise/section-wise comments within (auto review in word).

Editor's Details:

Dr. Vijay Kumar
Principal Scientist, ICAR-Central Sheep and Wool Research Institute, Arid Region Campus, India.