

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_102567
Title of the Manuscript:	Phytochemical Screening and Detection of Antioxidants Using the DPPH Assay of Costus speciosus: A Systematic Review.
Type of the Article	Review 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)	Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community as it gives information about the antioxidant activity of <i>Costus speciosus</i> which will help the researchers to gain knowledge about this plant species Title is ok The abstract is comprehensive but the EC50, IC50 mentioned in the keywords is not available in abstract Subsections are ok, future prospects of the study of this species in the manuscript is suggestive to add. Simple grammatical mistakes are there need to be corrected References are sufficient but inside text, all reference numbers are haphazardly given, so authors are suggested to give the references serially	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is ok	
Optional/General comments		

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abu Md Ashifkbal
Department, University & Country	Assam University, India