

## 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	  1. <b>Yes, because it brings important information regarding the chemical composition and Anatomy-histology of the species <i>Pycnanthus angolensis</i></b>  2. <b>No. Because what was presented as a result was the identification of some classes of secondary metabolites, minerals, and the specific anatomical and micrographic features of the plant.</b>  3. <b>The abstract is adequate</b>  4. <b>Yes, they are suitable</b>  5. <b>Yes, I believe it is correct</b>  6. <b>No. References are old, more current references should be used</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	  1. <b>Do an English review</b>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Sheylla Susan Moreira da Silva de Almeida</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidade Federal Do Amapá, Brazil</b>