

Reviewer's Comment:

Title - Why using in situ in the title but in vivo in the whole manuscript? Please be clear of the correct terms

Line 32-43 – should have addressed the previous comments below :

- 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?

Line 74 - 1cm refers to the length or width???? Please provide a proper dimension.

Line 115 - A₀ and A₁ should be written as A₀ and A₁.. for the description should be written as 'in which A₁= sample value while A₀ = control value.'

Table 1, Table 2 & Table 3– revised as below (remove the column S.No., place control treatment on the first row)

Table 3 – include the standard deviation

Table 4 & 5 – consider of presenting the data in line graph??

Standard for both table 4 and 5 are ascorbic acid? If it is, please use the same term consistently

Figure 2 – is unclear and poor presentation.. what does the blue colour represents? What does the orange colour represents? Improve the labeling and presentation (scientific presentation please!!)

Table 1. Effect of BAP, TDZ, NAA and KIN on initiation and multiple shoot induction from leaf explants of *Cadaba fruticosa* cultured on MS medium

Treatments				Shoot sprouting frequency %	Shoot No/explant	Shoot No/explants subculture	Shoot length (cm)
BAP μ M	TDZ μ M	KIN μ M	NAA μ M				
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.22	-	1.16	1.135	30.17 $\pm$ 0.19	5.04 $\pm$ 0.10	18.96 $\pm$ 0.13	6.05 $\pm$ 0.13
4.44	-	1.16	1.135	45.84 $\pm$ 0.25	12.93 $\pm$ 0.10	19.01 $\pm$ 0.10	6.41 $\pm$ 0.10
6.66	-	1.16	1.135	43.17 $\pm$ 0.16	9.98 $\pm$ 0.12	22.01 $\pm$ 0.14	6.25 $\pm$ 0.07
8.88	-	1.16	1.135	38.92 $\pm$ 0.16	10.03 $\pm$ 0.12	25.05 $\pm$ 0.13	6.28 $\pm$ 0.06
11.10	-	1.16	1.135	51.94 $\pm$ 0.11	11.96 $\pm$ 0.13	28.01 $\pm$ 0.11	6.45 $\pm$ 0.09
13.32	-	1.16	1.135	68.92 $\pm$ 0.10	15.98 $\pm$ 0.13	36.01 $\pm$ 0.14	6.98 $\pm$ 0.14
2.22	-	1.16	-	31.95 $\pm$ 0.12	08.01 $\pm$ 0.11	20.00 $\pm$ 0.15	5.01 $\pm$ 0.14

4.44	-	1.16	-	35.16 ± 0.12	10.10 ± 0.21	21.05 ± 0.13	5.03 ± 0.08
6.66	-	1.16	-	58.11 ± 0.10	11.01 ± 0.11	19.06 ± 0.14	4.06 ± 0.09
8.88	-	1.16	-	23.16 ± 0.11	12.03 ± 0.17	21.01 ± 0.14	4.36 ± 0.08
11.10	-	1.16	-	47.09 ± 0.09	13.78 ± 0.21	15.98 ± 0.11	5.18 ± 0.09
13.32	-	1.16	-	36.07 ± 0.12	14.03 ± 0.12	29.91 ± 0.20	4.54 ± 0.06
2.22	1.135	-	-	49.06 ± 0.14	08.05 ± 0.13	18.01 ± 0.11	7.47 ± 0.12
4.44	1.135	-	-	35.08 ± 0.11	10.12 ± 0.14	17.05 ± 0.13	6.47 ± 0.08
6.66	1.135	-	-	42.12 ± 0.14	11.90 ± 0.19	20.68 ± 0.19	6.28 ± 0.09
8.88	1.35	-	-	35.17 ± 0.13	12.13 ± 0.16	21.95 ± 0.11	5.38 ± 0.08
11.10	1.35	-	-	28.29 ± 0.13	12.43 ± 0.12	24.98 ± 0.09	5.17 ± 0.07
13.32	1.35	-	-	33.18 ± 0.12	13.13 ± 0.14	26.96 ± 0.12	4.85 ± 0.06

Author's Feedback:

- (1) Why focus on multiple shoots formation and not other means of tissue culture such as indirect regeneration or somatic embryogenesis

We tried for somatic embryogenesis and indirect regeneration, but the response is very poor. To compare in vivo and in vitro plant direct regeneration is advisable then indirect. Because true to type plants is possible through direct

- (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?

For medicinal purpose antioxidant activity comparison was conducted. Due to less facility and also our student are from poor background, it is not affordable

- (3) 1cm refers to the length or width???? Please provide a proper dimension.

Corrected as 1 cm length

- (4) Line 115 - A₀ and A₁ should be written as A₀ and A₁.. for the description should be written as 'in which A₁= sample value while A₀ = control value..'

Changed A₀ as A₀ and A₁ as Sample

- (5) Table 1, Table 2 & Table 3– revised as below (remove the column S.No., place control treatment on the first row)

Table 1, Table 2 & Table 3 revised

- (6) Table 3 – include the standard deviation

Included

- (7) Table 4 & 5 – consider of presenting the data in line graph??

Presented in line graph

- (8) Standard for both table 4 and 5 are ascorbic acid? If it is, please use the same term consistently

Changed

- (9) Figure 2 – is unclear and poor presentation. What does the blue colour represents? What does the orange colour represents? Improve the labeling and presentation (scientific presentation please)

Figure 2 changed