

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_98077
Title of the Manuscript:	Phytochemical study and evaluation of the antioxidant activity of extracts of the roots of <i>Chrysopogon nigritanus</i>
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. Yes. The investigation of potential medicinal plants used in traditional medicine is an uppermost important research subject. 2. Yes. It agrees with the assays applied and main findings. 3. The abstract is understandable but requires careful revision in some aspects (see the manuscript word file attached). 4. Yes. The manuscript is well-organized. 5. Some revisions are needed as well as the statistical analysis should be provided, and more references added to compare the results obtained with the literature available. 6. As stated above, more references are needed to support the main findings and statements made along the manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. Yes, the language is suitable and scientific.	
Optional/General comments	Please find the manuscript word file attached with comments and suggestions.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Diana Andreia Tavares Pinto
Department, University & Country	Polytechnic of Porto, Portugal