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	**1. Consistence should be followed on plant name for the entire manuscript: *Griffonia simplicifolia* at beginning and *G. simplicifolia* for rest** **2. Introduction reflects phytochemical properties of the plant than the conservation issues. Please include few conservation importance for the recommendation of vegetative propagation,** **3. Methodology part is lacking references, RCBD needs citation.** **4. Geographical location (Latitude and Longitude) should be mentioned as Degrees followed by minutes and then seconds.** **5. Experimental design is lacking study period (year, month and season)** **6. In reference citation Sadhu, 1989; Okunomo *et al*. 2009; Tisdale and Nelson 1975 were cited in text but not included in reference part.**	**1-** This has been addressed. *Griffonia simplicifolia* at beginning and *G. simplicifolia* for further mention in the manuscript. **2-** Emphasis was paid to gaps in conservation issues in the introduction where it is stated that there is dearth of information on conservation and propagation of the important medicinal plant. Phytochemical properties of the plant were stated to emphasis the need for its cultivation. **3-** References now included in the methodology. **4-** Geographical location now mentioned as degrees followed by minutes and then seconds. **5-** It is stated in the manuscript that study was conducted in an open area and a high humidity propagator chambers. Therefore, season was not a factor 6- References now included in the reference list.
Minor REVISION comments	1. In page number 7 Reading and Data Collection needs clarity. 2. In result part values are given in table 2 and 3 are with superscripts ^{abc} should be mentioned in foot note or can be removed. 3. Result values are not necessary in text as it is mentioned in table can be removed. 4. Grammatical and spelling errors should be corrected for the entire manuscript. 5. IUCN status of this plant should be mentioned (not threatened species).	1- The haeding has been modified as **Data collection**. 2- Superscripts are now mentioned in foot note. 3- Result values are now removed in text. 4- Grammatical and spelling errors have been corrected for the entire manuscript. 5- The plant is not enlisted on the IUCN **red** list released recently.
Optional/General comments	1. Title can be modifies as **A Case Study on Conservation of a rare medicinal plant *Griffonia simplicifolia* (Vahl ex DC) Baill by vegetative propagation.** 2. The physicochemical properties of the soil *ie*. Base of the plant stand and River sand are almost similar but top soil differs, it could be discussed.	1- Title now modified as **"Conservation of a rare medicinal plant by vegetative propagation: A case study of *Griffonia simplicifolia* (Vahl ex DC) Baill"** 2- Not considered.

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 issue