

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_98861
Title of the Manuscript:	HYDROALCOHOLIC EXTRACT OF TERMINALIA IVORENSIS ON FEET FUNGUS DESEASE
Type of the 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)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, but it lacks scientific rigour Title needs to be revised. Eg, Evaluation or effectiveness No, the abstract is not comprehensive, it lacks introduction results are not properly summarized Yes, the numbering style needs to be consistent eg., 1.,1.1. or 1,1.1 etc The MS, has problem in design, Is it clinical trial or traditional medicine? So, I don't think the MS is scientifically correct. The references are not properly cited, there is double bracket in the citation. Additional suggestion: -Why the author did test the effect of extract in human first? So, I suggest that the effectiveness of the herbal material needs to be evaluated on experimental animals, then based on the finding it may be further sought -The toxicity of the plat is not reported in animals, it was simply applied in human subjects, so it didn't consider ethical issues -In methodology, there is no control groups, it doesn't report how effective the plant is. -Results are correctly presented and described -To treat fungi, at least two weeks is mandatory, but the paper says the extract showed antifungal property after 2-5 day application, how? 	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There are many grammatical and syntax errors	
Optional/General comments	The paper, requires revision on the methodology, I don't recommend it to be published at this stage	

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:	Leake Gebremeskel
Department, University & Country	Aksum University, Ethiopia