

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_98394
Title of the Manuscript:	Phytochemical characterization and systemic exposure, evaluation of the aqueous extracts of Ficus thiningii Blume (Moraceae) on albino Wistar rats.
Type of the 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	yes	
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	okay	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Could have been more compact	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	Yes. Up to some extent	
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes	
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Check the following portion of the text: Phytochemical screening-Wagner test –page 4 Check the total text once again for different typological errors	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Panchali Sengupta
Department, University & Country	Maulana Azad College, University of Calcutta, India