

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_101997
Title of the Manuscript:	PHARMACOGNOSTIC EVALUATION OF THE LEAVES OF <i>Coccinia barteri</i> HOOK F (CUCURBITACEAE)
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 1.7

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. I found the article very interesting, however, since it does provide a very good explanation of the methodology for characterizing these natural products.</p> <p>2. Yes.</p> <p>3. Yes, it is very comprehensive and gives the reader a adequate synopsis of the manuscript.</p> <p>4. Yes, it is organized very well and is reader-friendly.</p> <p>5. The work that is presented is well done. However, I am concerned about the reproducibility of the analytical determinations. First, the analyses were repeated a limited number of times, but I agree that the reported ranges for the values seem reasonable. More importantly, only one collection or "batch" of <i>Coccinia barteri</i> is analyzed. The results would be far more impactful if plants from different locations exhibited the same chemical analyses to demonstrate the broad applicability of the evaluation. The evaluations on the single lot appear sound, but I would have preferred to see additional samples evaluated since the author claims the results are broadly representative.</p> <p>6. Yes, references are sufficient and recent. I have no further references to recommend.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Overall, the manuscript is well-written, but there are a few grammatical errors. One error that is repeated throughout the paper is that <i>Coccinia barteri</i>, <i>C. barteri</i>, etc., should be italicized throughout. Another: instead of ml (volume), it should be mL. Often, degree Celsius is represented as oC, and occasionally it is correctly represented as °C.</p> <p>In the determination of ash values, I believe the formula presented is incorrect. It should be $(W3-W1)/(W2-W1)$.</p> <p>The narrative for "Tests for gums and Mucilage" (not bolded) is identical to "PHYTOCHEMICAL TEST" – one or the other should be deleted.</p> <p>Finally, the author states that these employed criteria would prevent adulteration of the plant. I'm not sure what the author means by adulteration. Perhaps mention a specific example or two of an adulteration that these criteria would address.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kevin C. Cannon
Department, University & Country	Penn State Abington, USA