

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_93554
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF Rosmarinus officinalis ON MENTAL DISORDER SYMPTOMS IN INCARCERATED PEOPLE AND PRISON WORKERS
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> )

[Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Title of the manuscript:</b> The title is okay.</p> <p>But isn't in uppercase as it is.</p> <p>Effects would have been better off since more than one was observed during the research.</p> <p><b>Abstract:</b> The abstract wasn't stratified into aim, methodology, results, and conclusion as per the journal style.</p> <p><b>Keywords:</b> There are many things that go into prisons.</p> <p>It is better put as prison staff and incarcerated persons.</p> <p>Keywords are separated by commas and not semi-col</p> <p><b>Introduction:</b> The introduction is fairly okay in its introductory status of the title of the research.</p> <p>The cited references in the text are wrong.</p> <p>Two forms of reference citations are noted in the introductory part of the manuscript, which isn't in tune with the journal style.</p> <p><b>Materials and Methods:</b> Materials and Methods and not methods.</p> <p>And the main section ought to be numbered with sub-numbering of sub-sections as per the journal style, and ease of comprehension at glance.</p> <p>With respect to the statistical tools mentioned above, it isn't certain that all were used on the data obtained from the questionnaires and responses from the participants. Precisely, only those that were used were supposed to write.</p> <p>All the subsections ought to be numbered</p> <p><b>Results:</b> It wasn't numbered as the main section.</p> <p>The number of participants is very low. Six participants that withdrew should have been replaced since the main authors would have known about it from the start.</p> <p>Abbreviations used could be separated from the footnote of the table</p> <p>Table 1 hasn't been titled.</p> <p>Table 2. It hasn't titled.</p> <p>This isn't a table title. It is more or less a description. It can be reframed from the main points therein-doses of extracts and parameters used.</p>	

**Review Form 1.6**

	<p>Significance difference is best expressed as P = instead of P &lt; 0.05</p> <p>The summary of results per each table is supposed to be pointed, and not a detailed report.</p> <p>Tables must have titles that described their contents.</p> <p>Footnotes below the table are supposed to be precise and concise, and devoid of too much wordiness.</p> <p><b>Discussion: The citation</b> of the references in the text is wrong.</p> <p>It is fairly written.</p> <p><b>Conclusion:</b> The conclusion is okay.</p> <p><b>Reference list:</b> A few weren't written as per the journal style, and botanical names weren't written in italics</p> <p><b>The words or group of words in the red ink</b> indicate the corrections to be done or such aren't needed at moment.</p> <p><b>The words or group of words in the yellow ink</b> indicate the peer-reviewed comments for action to be taken.</p> <p><b>The words or group of words in the blue ink</b> indicate the corrections done by the peer-reviewed.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Peter Shaba</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>College of Agriculture, Nigeria</b>