

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_101807
Title of the Manuscript:	The ameliorative effect of Ashwagandha- Withania somnifera (L.) Dunal on park25 induced neurodegeneration in Drosophila melanogaster Parkinson's disease model
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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. <b>Yes the manuscript is much important for the scientific community as it discusses the neurodegenerative disease (PD)</b></p> <p>2. <b>The above featured title suits well to the study</b></p> <p>3. <b>Abstract is not much comprehensive and it should be precise</b></p> <p>4. <b>Sub sections enlisted in the article is neatly written and the problem lies in its arrangements [After the Reference heading, author should not add any heading but here there exists a detailed note of Figure! ]</b></p> <p>5. <b>Yes the manuscript is correct to its point</b></p> <p>6. <b>References are not sufficient and the author has to include references regarding the diseases like Alzheimer, Parkinson to make this manuscript perfect.</b></p> <p>Author did their part well and good but at the same time minor corrections left all around this manuscript.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Yes their language is good throughout the manuscript	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Boopathi Raja M</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>The Erode College of Pharmacy, India</b>