Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_EJMP_58512**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Conservation of a rare medicinal plant: A case study of Griffonia simplicifolia (Vahl ex DC) Baill**
Type of the Article	**Original Research 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/journal/10/editorial-policy)

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	Carnevale et al., 2010 use et al in italick, Write of media of propagation technique like IBA or other root initiating hormone and treatment of cutting fumigation etc if used Root length and no of root, sprouting of leaves data is also include in this regards give methods adopted to do this Only soil is not a factor for propagation so elaborate all things which is used to conserve this plant	- et al. used in italics as suggested and highlighted in the manuscript as suggested. - The soil media used are stated in the manuscript as topsoil, river sand and soil. The physicochemical composition of the soil is presented in Table 1. - The methods adopted to get root number, no of roots, sprouting of leaves are stated in the manuscript. - Apart from soil used for propagation, other techniques and cultivation practices used were adequately stated in the manuscript.
Minor REVISION comments	No	
Optional/General comments	No	

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	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)* The reviewer criticised the manuscript objectively with technical inputs. All comments made by the reviewer have been addressed as highlighted in manuscript. The manuscript is a lot better and fine for publication
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	No ethical issues.