

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>European Journal of Medicinal Plants</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_EJMP_106450</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Top Edible Wild Plants of Eastern Mediterranean Region. Part II: Anti-inflammatory Activity</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review type article</b>

## Review Form 1.7

### 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)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. This review type manuscript is important for scientific community, since aim to establish the most advanced knowledge of anti-inflammatory activity presented by edible medicinal plants from the Mediterranean region. My only concern is that the manuscript lacks a section that accounts for the choice, organization, and critical analysis of the 144 bibliographic references used. That is, a bibliometric study is required, justifying the fields of inquiry, the time interval, selectivity criteria and the most prominent authors.</li><li>2. The title of the article is suitable.</li><li>3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive.</li><li>4. After the introduction section, a section is missing that describes the bibliographic research method that was followed in this work.</li><li>5. I think that the manuscript lacks a section that explains the methodology followed for the selection, organization and analysis of bibliographic references</li><li>6. The references are sufficient and recent. However, a time period must be chosen and justified for the bibliographic references used.</li></ol> <p>Corrections are highlighted in the attached document. In green colour, suggested corrections are marked. In yellow colour, it is highlighted what of the original text must be revised and blue colour some comments to take in account.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</li></ol>	
<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>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Jairo Antonio Cubillos Lobo</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidad Pedagógica y Tecnológica de Colombia, Colombia</b>