

## 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> 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. <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<p>The manuscript entitled "Phytochemical study and evaluation of the antioxidant activity of extracts of the roots of <i>Chrysopogon nigritanus</i>" is well organized and the results are of interest for the researchers in the field.</p> <p>The title of the article is suitable for the journal.</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive enough but should include also a conclusion.</p> <p>The subsections are appropriate. The conclusion section has number 1. I think was a mistake and should be addressed.</p> <p>The article is scientifically enough.</p> <p>The references are recent enough but are necessary more titles for a proper discussion section. So please add more references on list and compare your results with other authors findings. All Latin names, including family and order should be italic. You should mention how the plant was identified and who made the identification.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is suitable for scholarly communications	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The paper is overall good and is suitable for publication in the journal.	

### 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:	Florin Muselin
Department, University & Country	University of Life Sciences, Romania