

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Cardiovascular Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCD_98492
Title of the Manuscript:	Medicinal Plants with antihypertensive activity. A review
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.journalijrc.com/index.php/AJRCD/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)	The article brings important aspects related to herbs with anti-hypertensive effects. Yes, it is. The purpose of the study can be expressed much more clearly. Yes, they are. Yes, it is. I think there are too many bibliographic sources. The dates from the table are well organised.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	I made some changes on the first page. The authors should improve the rest of the text.	
Optional/General comments	The article should be accepted after minor revision.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Predescu Nicoleta Corina
Department, University & Country	University of Agronomic Sciences and Veterinary Medicine, Romania