

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_95341
Title of the Manuscript:	Ethnobotanical and floristic investigations of Datura species in Mali
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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)	1. The MS contains floristic lists of an area in mali, which is a botanical wealth. Of which the author/s focused on datura ethnobotanical profile. So I can notice its relevance for scientific community 2. I think the title could be taken as suitable 3. Yes abstract, being a miniature research, includes major section of the MS 4. Sub-section is okay; but need huge revision. Example method of data collection for both floristic study, and ethnobotanical study needs separately explained. Sampling methods and sampling design were not clearly indicated. I advise the author/s to include this for the betterment of the MS. Even methods of analysis are not clear for both the ethnobotanical and floristic study. The author/s should clearly indicate them. The discussion section is too shallow, and should be corrected or revised 5. Yes it is scientifically correct	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Some terminologies such as registered, association, etc are not appropriate botanical terms.	
Optional/General comments	The paper gives a botanical knowledge on the floristic composition and ethnobotanical profile of datura to the scientific community. However, the method of data collection and analysis, sampling design and discussion part needs major revisions	

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:	Alemayehu Kefalew
Department, University & Country	Debre Markos University, Ethiopia