

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_96811
Title of the Manuscript:	Australian Aboriginal traditional medicine
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)
<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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. As it is non-explored variety of medicinal plant it may help community and researchers to explore same plants.</p> <p>2. Title is not suitable as only two medicinal plants are there, can be includes in title. Suggested title can be "Review on Australian Aboriginal traditional medicine as <i>Hibbertia scandens</i> and <i>Lophostemon suaveolens</i>"</p> <p>3. Abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. More subsection can be added as biological/pharmacological activities of plants, phytochemistry, traditional uses of plants.</p> <p>5. Manuscript is ok, but modification is required.</p> <p>6. More references can be added and should be written in appropriate format.</p> <p>7. As two plants are mentioned as non-exploited varieties <i>Hibbertia scandens</i> and <i>Lophostemon suaveolens</i> more details of both medicinal plants should be included in the manuscript.</p> <p>8. Plant name is not written properly in manuscript.</p> <p>9. First Nation medicinal plant list or names are not provided in manuscript.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Language of article is suitable for scholarly communication	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Manuscript should be revised for acceptance with additional published data.	

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)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sneha Nawale
Department, University & Country	Gokaraju Rangaraju College of Pharmacy, Osmania University, India