



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_32507
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of growth regulators on direct shoot formation from leaf explant and antioxidant activity of leaf and in vitro plants of <i>Cadaba fruticosa</i> (Linn.) Druce - an endemic medicinal plant
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	- Section 2.2, line 73 – please state the size of the explants used and not just stating appropriate size was used. - Line 79-84 : state the concentrations tested - Line 84-87 : should state the methodology and not the results in this section - Section 2 – should have a clear and descriptive subsection on (1) Induction of multiple shoots (2) Induction of root prior to section 2.3 - Line 90- state the length of roots or plantlets that were selected for this studies - Section 2.3 – state the number of plantlets used in this study - Line 96 – state the age of the in vivo and in vitro materials - Line 106 – state the concentration	The leaf explant size is 1 cm, included. Various concentration of growth hormones are Benzyl amino purine (BAP 2.22 -13.32 μM), Kinetin (KIN 1.16 μM), Thidiazuron (TDZ 1.135 μM) and naphthalene acidic acid (NAA 1.135 μM) Changed Subtitle included. 5.5 cm root length 20 plantlets <i>In vivo</i> plant age not known and 50 days aged in vitro plantlets used for extraction. Ethanol and methanol extracts were used various concentration such as 1 mg/ml to 5 mg/ml. A1 is sample value and A0 is control



SDI Review Form 1.6

	- Line 111 – explain what is A1, A0 - Unclear presentation of Table 1& Table 2. What is S. No? are they replicates? If they are, only average data are required. - Title of Table 2 should be above the table and not below - Poor presentation of figure 2 – a scientific presentation is required - Section 3.3 – data with standard deviation is required - The results (section 3.2& 3.3) should be better analysed and elaborated by stating on the observation based on different concentrations of PGRs - Discussion of each section was weak and lack in depth.	value. S. numbers are not the replicates. The data's were obtained from triplicate. Values are mean $\pm$ SEM of three samples Corrected Fig 2 removed and table included Table included Changed corrected
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	• Introduction section should be further improved by including the following points: (1) Why focus on multiple shoots formation and not other means of tissue culture such as indirect regeneration or somatic embryogenesis (2) Justify specifically why antioxidant studies were conducted show the similarity between in vitro and in vivo materials? Why not molecular studies which are more reliable and convincing? • The brand of each chemicals used should be stated as in all scientific publications.	To compare in vivo and in vitro plant direct regeneration is advisable then indirect. Because true to type plants is possible through direct For medicinal purpose antioxidant activity comparison was conducted. Included
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	• Please re-check the manuscript, some words are combined (e.g. Line 7& Line 96).	Checked and corrected