

## 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	Research 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		
<b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	The present study highlights the distinctive ethnopharmacological characteristics of <i>Pycnanthus angolensis</i> which can be further explored by other researchers on the efficacy of the compounds reported.	
<b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
<b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>	Please rephrase this sentence: A recent ethnobotanical survey revealed this plant in the traditional treatment of viral and parasitic pathologies. Replaced the word "revealed". Not appropriate.	
<b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	Yes	
<b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>	Yes	
<b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>	No, please add reference from recently published paper.	
<b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	Please check for grammatical errors and sentence structure. There are multiple grammatical errors in the manuscript. Re-write the conclusion part.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Need revision in terms of sentence structure and choice of words	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	No comments on the finding. Data is publishable. However, the manuscript needs a proofreading for the language part	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Sarmila Muthukrishnan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Institute of Bioscience, Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia</b>