

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_103773
Title of the Manuscript:	Elucidating the Anti-inflammatory Properties of Garcinia kola and Vernonia amygdalina through In Silico Molecular Biology Techniques
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The topics of in silico simulations of binding of the potential drug substances with their target receptor locations are current and important for the medical advances thus a study related to potential novel non-steroid anti-inflammatory drugs is supposed to raise the interest of potential Readers.</p> <p>The title of the article relates to its contents.</p> <p>The Abstract mirrors the structure and the crucial contents of the main text of the article.</p> <p>The article is logically organized, although there is no proper Discussion section where the Authors would interpret their findings and contrast them with similar studies results published by other authors.</p> <p>I did not identify any flaws disqualifying the article.</p> <p>The literature references are numerous and recent enough.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language quality is satisfactory although a correction of style by an English native speaker experienced in scientific writing is advisable to improve the style.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript consists of total 13 pages, including 6 figures, 2 tables and the list of total 28 literature references. The topic is highly specialised and it is advisable to get a second review from a specialist in pharmaceutical chemistry, which unfortunately I am not.</p>	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Robert Suslo
Department, University & Country	Wroclaw Medical University, Poland