



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	First of all, I would like to thank the scientist/s for this study. Here are some opinion and corrections; IN TOPIC: 1- The topic is long so it is better that deleting the plant's author names. 2- activity of (nature ETC.) leaf and <i>in vitro</i> plants..... adding " Nature or field or <i>in situ</i>" can be more suitable. IN ABSTRACT: 1- Line 8: "1962" not necessary in this part 2- Line 13: need (nature ETC.) leaf 3- Key word: why only BAP and NAA (adding Kin also was successful). IN INTRODUCTION: 1- Line 46: We need some information about the plants because of being tissue culture exp. (is the plant perennial?, woody?, evergreen?, flowering?). Chemical and medicinal informations are ok. IN MATERIAL-METHODS: 1- When the plant collected? (In which month?) 2- Line 68: not "Fig 1". "Fig. 1. a." Better. 3- Line 73: what size the explants? 4- Line 81: <i>In vitro</i> raised..... not need the sentence because of Line 83 again says same. 5- Line 84: add "for rooting" after 2 g/l 6- Line 84-87 : The highest..... this sentence give result but this part is mat-met. This sentence can be deleted. 7- Line 91: ..various (what is the various?) 8- Line 90-94: acclimatization in growth chamber? In	Changed as per comments In line 8 the year is removed Line 13 word changed as <i>in vivo</i> leaf Kinetin included This plant is evergreen plant and it is information given in manuscript introduction part in the line number is 46. We collected plant throughout the year. Line 68 fig is changed as fig A. The explant size is 1 cm. For rooting added after 2 g/l. In line 84-87 the highest removed. Various mean different soil combination (see table 3) In shade house Ref 17 removed, added in methodology Ref 18 removed, added in methodology DPPH wrote as 2,2-Diphenyl-1-Picrylhydrazyl



SDI Review Form 1.6

	greenhouse? 9- Line 101: ref 17 can be written in text not near topic 10- Line 113: ref 18 can be written in text not near topic 11- Line 102: DPPH can be written clearly at least one time 12- Line 115: FRAP can be written clearly at least one time 13- Line 138: not 79.2% (according to table 68.92%) 14- Line 142: Not Fig 1 (Fig 1.a,b,c) 15- Line 158: Table 2 topic can be send above table IN RESULTS: 1- Figure 1 d,e,f,g,h must be mention in text. IN CONCLUSION: 1- Line 241: not 2.26 (according to table 2.68) IN REFERENCES: 1- Ref. 9 : there is "et al" correct them IN ALL TEXT: 4- Most of words have been written without giving any gap. Even in topic , in reference, in table or figure topic.(...of <i>Cadaba</i>....)must (...of <i>Cadaba</i>....) Please check all text and give a gap for each.	FRAP wrote as Ferric Reducing Ability of Plasma 79.2% changed as 68.92% Fig 1 is changed as Fig a, b, c. Table 2 topic wrote above the table. included Line 241 the value changed as 2.68. In ref 9 et al corrected. All checked
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		