

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | European Journal of Medicinal Plants   |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_EJMP_100300   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Ethnopharmacological characteristics of <i>Pycnanthus angolensis</i> (Welw.) Warb. (Myristicaceae), a plant with antiparasitic and antiviral effects |
| 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) |
|--|---|---|
| <p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b><br/>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br/>(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>Based on the properties described, and those justifying its traditional use, the manuscript is of relevance.</p> <p>Ethnopharmacological characteristics of <i>Pycnanthus angolensis</i> (Welw.) Warb. (Myristicaceae).</p> <p>Yes it is</p> <p>Yes they are</p> <p>The manuscript is of scientific importance</p> <p>Kindly reference the following: the abstract, the methods, the systematic position</p> <p>The title should be left short and straight forward, (a plant with anti parasitic and anti viral effects) is not a finding of the manuscript, rather an affirmation of its traditional use which is presented in the discussion.</p> |   |
| <p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>   | Good enough   |   |
| <p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>  | The manuscript is well structured, easily understandable and of scientific relevance. Despite lack of references especially in the methodology and in other sections, the paper is good enough to be published.   |   |

### 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>Fowdlung Ngufor Agafina</b>            |
| Department, University & Country | <b>Université des Montagnes, Cameroon</b> |