



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> 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?)	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	8- Line 90-94: acclimatization in growth chamber? In 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- Table 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.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Aysun Cavusoglu</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Kocaeli University, Turkey</i>