

Reviewer's Comments

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Major Comments: Reviewer-1

1. Are there controversies in this field? What are the most recent and important achievements in the field? In my opinion, answers to these questions should be emphasized. Perhaps, in some cases, novelty of the recent achievements should be highlighted by indicating the year of publication in the text of the manuscript.

Answer: Some latest and important achievements in this field are incorporated in the text and highlighted also

2. The results and discussion section is very weak and no emphasis is given on the discussion of the results like why certain effects are coming in to existence and what could be the possible reason behind them?

Answer: As per the suggestion of the reviewer, the results and discussion section is revised thoroughly and is highlighted as well.

3. Conclusion: not properly written.

Answer: As per the suggestion of the reviewer, the conclusion section is revised and is highlighted as well.

4. Results and conclusion: The section devoted to the explanation of the results suffers from the same problems revealed so far. Your storyline in the results section (and conclusion) is hard to follow. Moreover, the conclusions reached are really far from what one can infer from the empirical results.

Answer: As per the suggestion of the reviewer, all the three sections i.e. result, discussion and conclusion are revised completely and now they are written as connected with each other as well as highlighted.

5. The discussion should be rather organized around arguments avoiding simply describing details without providing much meaning. A real discussion should also link the findings of the study to theory and/or literature.

Answer: As per the suggestion of the reviewer, in the discussion section more and recent articles are cited and are organized in a serial manner.

6. Spacing, punctuation marks, grammar, and spelling errors should be reviewed thoroughly. I found so many typos throughout the manuscript.

Answer: As per the suggestion of the reviewer, the paper is checked by grammarly software and also checked by an English professor.

7. English is modest. Therefore, the authors need to improve their writing style. In addition, the whole manuscript needs to be checked by native English speakers.

Answer: As per the suggestion of the reviewer, the paper is checked by grammarly software and also checked by an English professor.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Major Comments: Reviewer-2

1. The manuscript has interesting content. However, the implications in experimental medicine are unclear. Results and conclusions should be clearly linked to medical applications. That could be clear by mean of enrichment in introduction, discussion (results and discussion section is too brief) and conclusions section.

Answer: As per the suggestion of the reviewer, all the four sections i.e. introduction, result, discussion and conclusion are revised completely and now they are written as connected with each other, as well as highlighted.

2. In discussion, it should be added data for comparisson with previous analysis of related species. Also, by addition of recent papers regarding biological action of compounds identified as main active compounds in Vitex negundo and related species. Also, comparisson between main components in the callum or leaves. In addition, the mention of other components which could be action albeit if are not among main components, or are not in the ethanolic extract is desirable.

Answer: As per the suggestion of the reviewer, in the discussion section more and recent articles are cited and are organized in a serial manner. The data of related latest papers are now incorporated in the discussion section and highlighted also.

Revision reviewer

Specific Comments to Authors:

Results and conclusion: The section devoted to the explanation of the results suffers from the same problems revealed so far. Your storyline in the results section (and conclusion) is hard to follow. Moreover, the conclusions reached are really far from what one can infer from the empirical results.

Answer: I have modified the result and discussion as per your suggestions. I have also tried my level best to make the correlation between result and conclusion part.