



SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
<p>I have gone through all the stages for evaluating the manuscript under review and my comments are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is poorly written in terms of grammar. The author needs to remove these grammatical errors present throughout the manuscript. It would be better to take help of some English Language grammar expert. 2. As suggested by one of the reviewer, there is no such word as 'antioxidant vitamin'. However, the authors had given baseless justification for keeping this in the title of the manuscript. As per my view, the reviewer is right as it confuses the readers, Secondly, the authors have not performed any analysis for testing or comparing the antioxidant activity of the test leaves. So, remove the word antioxidant from title as well as the main body of the manuscript. 3. The authors had not mentioned details of the instruments used in the study. 4. Most important point is that, no details of statistical analysis are mentioned in the methodology part. If no statistical analysis is performed, then how the authors are claiming value for a particular parameter in one type of leaves is different from the other type of leaves? There is no meaning of study without scientific and statistical analysis. 5. Discussion part should always include what you get and what were the results of similar work conducted in the past by other workers. How your work is similar or different from that and what could be the possible reasons for this. All this information is missing in the discussion part. 6. Authors have not performed any analysis for anti-oxidative, anti-diabetic, anti-arthritis or such other effects of the leaves. Just on the basis of compositional analysis, authors cannot recommend these leaves in diet or for preparation of medicines. The whole conclusion part should be written on the basis of results obtained and not on the basis of probable therapeutic effects of these macro and micro constituents. 	<p>Grammatical errors as pointed out by two earlier reviewers have been faithfully corrected. Authors have diligently gone through the manuscript again and are ready to effect any more grammatical errors should there be pointed out.</p> <p>“Antioxidant” before “Vitamin” expunged wherever it occurred in the manuscript.</p> <p>Since the methods were not detailed in the text, authors did not see the need to give details of the instruments used as this are available in the references to the methods employed. Nevertheless indications as to the equipment used were presented in the determination of mineral and vitamins.</p> <p>Statistical analysis was indeed carried out. This has been included in the methods section. See 2.2.5</p> <p>Suggestion taken. Comparison with similar work now included.</p> <p>Authors take your point and have deleted the recommendation. In an earlier paper (Reference 7) on the comparative phytochemicals, the plant were found to be rich in phytochemicals with antioxidant activity. It was also mentioned therein that the basis for selecting the four plants was their validated antidiabetic activity. They have also been shown to be anti-oxidative and anti-arthritis. We were not making any conclusion here but saying our results could possible explain (ie have good correlation) these observed effects from other works.</p> <p>Authors are thankful for the review which has been most instructive.</p>