

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_104196
Title of the Manuscript:	Pharmacological investigation of in-vitro anti-inflammatory, antimicrobial, thrombolytic, cytotoxic and in vivo analgesic activities of Diospyros malabarica
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> <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. The scientific finding from this research work may have a significant contribution to pharmacology to adopt plant-based extracts as a potential tool in drug discovery.</p> <p>2. Based on the conclusion obtained from the research work the title can be reframed as "Evaluation of anti-inflammatory, antimicrobial, thrombolytic, cytotoxic and analgesic activities of <i>Diospyros malabarica</i> leaf extract".</p> <p>3. Abstract is comprehensive and well-articulated.</p> <p>4. Clearly defined</p> <p>5. The clearly described method validates the scientific findings</p> <p>6. References are sufficient. Suggested to include the reference in the methodology.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Much is expected with scientific terminologies.</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> The present study utilized <i>Artemia salina</i> as a zoological organism model. Hence, it may warrant clearance from regulatory bodies.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Balachander Manoharan
Department, University & Country	Biocontrol Research Laboratories, India