

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_96171
Title of the Manuscript:	INDUCTION AND TREATMENT OF POLYCYSTIC OVARY SYNDROME WITH PLANT EXTRACT IN RATS: 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)	1- The manuscript is important for scientific community 2- I found no relation of the title with the article, from my view, I suggest (The role of plant extract of rats on the health of PCOS women). 3- I found the abstract of the article not comprehensive. 4- The subsections & structures of the manuscript need more arrangement 5- I think the manuscript scientifically correct. 6- References are sufficient although about 70% were far from the last 5 years	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	From my view ,I found the language quality not so suitable for scholarly communications as they were native with faults in grammar	
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Manal Madani Abdul Qader
Department, University & Country	Al Mustansiriyah Collage of Medicine, Iraq