

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_107647
Title of the Manuscript:	PHARMACOGNOSTIC CHARACTERISTICS OF SIMAROUBA GLAUCA DC BARK
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? Yes, this manuscript important for scientific community especially in herbal medicine investigation</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? Before tittle: Pharmacognostic characteristics of <i>Simarouba glauca</i> DC Bark Recommendation title: Pharmacognostic evaluation of <i>Simarouba glauca</i> DC Bark"</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? In the abstract section we need to add information regarding the use of <i>Simarouba glauca</i> DC Bark, especially for medicinal purposes, to convince readers of the importance of research on the pharmacognostic evaluation of this plant.</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Although this research is a type of exploratory research carried out by identifying the pharmacognostic characteristics of this plant, it is also necessary to discuss the identification results in the Results and discussion section.</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Yes, I think this manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. It needs to update some older references such as 1959, 1964, 1998 etc. with newer references if possible</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes, the language/ English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Martina Kurnia Rohmah
Department, University & Country	Universitas Anwar Medika, Indonesia