

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">European Journal of Medicinal Plants</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_90669
Title of the Manuscript:	Characteristics of medicinal plants used in oral diseases treatment in southern Benin
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:

(<https://www.journalejmp.com/index.php/EJMP/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript consists of total 18 pages, including 2 figures, 2 tables and the list of total 31 literature references. The article presents original results of the study on natural remedies used in folk medicine for various oral cavity ailments and on the healers who use them. As such, the article fits into the topic scope of the Journal. The contents of the article may have high value in selecting the plants as promising sources of potential new materials for pharmaceuticals. I am not a botany pharmacy specialist so I cannot directly judge the merit correctness of the information provided by the Authors. The manuscript has a logical structure and is written in acceptable quality English. The title is only partly relevant to the contents of the article as it omits to mention the valuable information on the herbal healers contained in it - the title shall be modified to encompass both parts of the presented study, e.c . "Characteristics of herbal healers and medicinal plants use as traditional medicines in oral diseases treatment in southern Benin"</p> <p>The Abstract is quite long, it mirrors both the structure and core contents of the main text adequately; there is typing mistake "forty-six (44)" which needs correction.</p> <p>The Introduction provides accurate background for the investigated scientific problem. However, the Authors write ". Chlorhexidine is known to have cytotoxic effects and to cause teeth staining [9]. A relationship has also been established between ethanol in common mouthwashes and oral cancer [10]." The sources they refer to are so called "alternative medicine" and they cannot be treated as reliable as "alternative medicine" does not support scientific approach in hypotheses verification based on rigorous experimental studies; therefore, it is not enough justified to undermine the trust into accepted by the mainstream medicine substances (chlorhexidine, ethanol) based on such not enough credible sources; in result, the implicated 2 sentences and the 2 indicated sources shall be removed from the article for the sake of keeping the text trustworthy.</p> <p>The Material and Method section is detailed enough, supported additionally by a figure.</p> <p>The Results are consistent with the described methodology, presented clearly, divided into subsections and tables; n the Figure 2 it would be beneficial to add labels with numbers to the graph.</p> <p>The Discussion places the Authors' results into the broader context of previously available knowledge. The statement "the choice of traditional herbalists is based on their important role in the primary health care system" is not true and it shall be removed as herbalists are not part of the mainstream medicine-related primary healthcare system.</p> <p>The Conclusions are consistent with the discussed results; there is typing mistake "forty-six (44)" which needs correction.</p> <p>The references are numerous and recent enough, relevant to the topic of the paper; their format needs to be unified for the whole list.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Robert Suslo</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Wroclaw Medical University, Poland</b>